THE

AMERICAN

BC

CATHOLIC QUARTERLY

REVIEW.

Bonum est homini ut eum veritas volentem, quia malum est homini ut eum veritas vincat invitum. Nam ipsa vincat necesse est, sive negantum sive confitentum.

S. AUG. EPIST. CCXXXVIII. AD PASCENT.

VOLUME VII.

FROM JANUARY TO OCTOBER, 1882.

PHILADELPHIA:
HARDY & MAHONY,
PUBLISHERS AND PROPRIETORS,
505 CHESTNUT STREET.

COPYRIGHT, 1882,

BY

HARDY & MAHONY.

10740

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

PAGE

METHODISM AND ITS METHODS. By *John Gilmary Shea, LL.D.*, . . . 1

What manner of man John Wesley was, 1; Condition of England and the colonies in his time, 2; Sketch of the Wesley brothers, 2; John Wesley and the Church of England, 3; His first visit to America and return to England, 4; Organization and progress of Methodism, 5; How Wesleyanism came to America and prospered here, 6; Wesley's amended liturgy, 7; Summary of his doctrines, 8; Methodism and Episcopalianism, 9; Government of the Methodist Church, 10; Methodism before and during the civil war, 11; Its influence in politics and the press, 12; Where and how it has lost power, 13; What General Grant has done for it, 14; Its influence broken by Garfield's election, 16.

COUNT JOSEPH DE MAISTRE. By *A. J. Faust, A.M., Ph.D.*, . . . 17

Count de Maistre's place in Catholic literature, 17; His fascinating character, 18; Sketch of his life, 19; Influence on him of the philosophy of the times, 20; Courage of himself and his spouse in the Revolution, 22; Bright side of a life of trial, 23; He always shared the fortunes of his king, 24; He is appointed Minister Plenipotentiary at St. Petersburg, 26; His life and observations at the Russian capital, 28; Relations with his brother, Count Xavier, 29; He is joined by his youthful son, Rudolph, 30; How Count de Maistre regarded the downfall of Napoleon, 31; His attachment to, and influence in, St. Petersburg, 33; Catholicity in Russian society, 34; How he regarded the hostility to the Jesuits, 35; End of his honorable and consistent career of diplomacy in Russia, 36; His prominent place among the prophets of the past, 37; Correctness of his appreciation of Napoleon and the Revolution, 39; He was no double dealer in political diplomacy, 40.

WESTMINSTER ABBEY. By *Arthur Featherstone Marshall, B.A., Oxon.*, . . 41

The Abbey before the Reformation and after, 41; The Church and its furniture, 42; Character of the late Dean of Westminster, 43; Sketch of the Abbey's history, 44; Why it is more than a mere English Catholic Church, 45; Its connection with English royalty as well as religion, 46; What have the modern centuries given us back in place of the old Catholic Westminster Abbey? 47; Ideas associated with the coronation of Queen Victoria, 50; St. Paul's as the rival of Westminster, 52.

ARCHBISHOP MACHALE. By *John MacCarthy*, ... 53

Dr. MacHale was an O'Connell in the priesthood, 53; Condition of the world at the time of his birth, 54; Ireland in the last century, 55; Results of the American Revolution in Ireland, 56; The scenes amid which John MacHale's youth was spent, 57; From the hedge-school to Maynooth, 58; His great collegiate success, 59; O'Connell's first public speech against the Union, 59; The priests in politics and the Kildare Street Association, 60; Dr. Doyle, Archbishop Murray, and the Catholic Association, 61; Dr. MacHale as Bishop of Kilala, 62; The Clare election and the Catholic Relief Act, 63; Bishop MacHale's first visit to Rome, 64; His position in the Tithes dispute, 65; He becomes Archbishop of Tuam and helps O'Connell in the Repeal Agitation, 66; Death of O'Connell, the famine, the young Irelanders, 67; From the Ecclesiastical Titles Bill to the O'Connell centenary, 68; His later years spent in retirement, 69; His character and life work, 70.

PROTESTANT ISMS AND CATHOLICITY IN THE UNITED STATES. By *Rev. T. J. Jenkins*, ... 71

Protestantism a house divided against itself, 71; The latest apologist of denominationalism in the United States, 72; Examination of Dr. Schaff's statistics, 74; Membership of non-Catholic denominations compared, 76; Dr. Hitchcock's and Dr. Schaff's double-back-action integral calculus, 77; Other statistics compared with theirs, 78; Sifting Dr. Schaff's figures and facts regarding the Catholic Church, 79; Diversity of computation among the Catholics, 80; Increase of churches and decrease of faith among Protestants, 81; Proportion of Catholics to Protestants, 82; Catholics gaining, Protestants losing, 83; The issue is now between Catholicity and Skepticism, 84.

GALILEO GALILEI AND THE COPERNICAN SYSTEM. By *Rt. Rev. P. N. Lynch, D.D.*, ... 85

Pertinacity of the popular error about Galileo, 85; Documents concerning him recently brought to light in Europe, 86; Sketch of his early life, 87; His great discoveries, 88; Honors in reward of his success, 89; His connection with the Copernican theory, 90; The Protestant and Catholic churches in relation to science, 91; The point at issue between Galileo and the authorities at Rome, 92; Condemnation of two propo-

PAGE

sitions constituting the Copernican theory, 93; Galileo's case before the Holy Office and the Congregation of the Index, 94; He seeks approbation at Rome for his work, 95; Why there were such embittered feelings against him, 96; He is brought before the holy tribunal officially and in custody, 97; His life of so-called imprisonment, 98; The "examen rigorosum" in his case, 99; He is cross-examined before the tribunal, 100; His sentence pronounced, 101; His abjuration and incarceration, 102; The real cause of the celebrity which he has attained, 103; Weakness of the charges against the Church regarding him, 104; What might have happened had he acted a manly part, 105; The action of the Holy Office as to the cause of controversy, 107; The decree of the Index was not against the progress of science, 109; It was merely a disciplinary enactment, 110; The view of the question here presented not a modern one, 111; Quotations proving this from theological teachers of high repute, 112; The mature judgment of Catholics is that of Tiraboschi, 114.

IRELAND'S OPPORTUNITY—WILL IT BE LOST? By *John Boyle O'Reilly*, . 114

Review of Irish political movements since the famine, 114; Origin of the Land League, 115; Measure of its success, 116. Why it should be kept in existence, 117; Favorable circumstances of the present year, 118; Why an armed revolution is impracticable, 119; The Irish should demand Home Rule and the Irish in America should help them, 120.

THE EARLY FRANCISCAN MISSIONS IN THIS COUNTRY. By *John Gilmary Shea, LL.D.*, ... 121

Catholic missionaries in early American History, 121; The first Franciscans on the Pacific coast, 122; Their labors in Florida, 123; Gaining a permanent foothold in the far West, 124; French Franciscans in the North, 125; Cardinal Richelieu and the Franciscans, 126; Extent of their missions, 127; Driven from one field, they go to work in another, 128; Protestant and Indian hostility against them, 129; The venerable Antonio Margil's labors, 130; He was a typical Franciscan, 132; Father Junipero Serra in Upper California, 133; Franciscans in Louisiana and in the United States since the Revolution, 134; The religious life in the United States, 135.

THE PROBLEM OF MAN'S DESTINY—HOW MUCH HAS UNREVEALED SCIENCE DONE TOWARDS ITS SOLUTION? By *Rev. S. Fitzsimons*, . . 137

Have we real cause to blush for our unwisdom? 137; Difficulty and responsibility of the task before the scientists, 138; The question must not be trifled with, 139; Scanty crop of the world's labors in the field of research, 140; The philosophers have failed to solve the Sphinx's riddle, 141; Advancement in other departments of knowledge, 142; But minds are still dark on the one great problem, 145; Means and chances of success seldom computed, 147; Easy access to knowledge at the present day, 148; The solution of the problem of man's destiny is, however, as difficult as ever, 149; Our knowledge generally very limited, 150; "The proper study of mankind is man," 151; Man a mystery to himself, 152; Our present knowledge and our past ignorance, 153; The task before the positive scientists, 154; Theory of the co-ordination of knowledge, 155; No chance of science solving the problem of human destiny, 156; Full knowledge beyond the grasp of intellect, 158; Absurd solutions of the great problem, 160; Barren results of the fruitless inquiry, 161.

THE SUPPOSED FALL OF HONORIUS, AND HIS CONDEMNATION. By *J. H. R.*, 162

Peculiar interest of the case of Honorius—its origin, 162; The formula of Honorius as opposed to that of Monothelism, 163; Various proceedings anent these formulæ, 164; Questions arising out of them, 165; Arguments in favor of Honorius and Papal Infallibility, 165; Two things that must be established by opponents, 167; The opinions of other Popes concerning Honorius, 168.

THE RELIGIOUS RIGHTS OF CATHOLICS IN PUBLIC INSTITUTIONS. By *John Gilmary Shea, LL.D.*, ... 193

No term more abused than that of religious freedom, 193; Established Churches in the American English Colonies, 194; Religious rights under the Constitution of the United States, 195; Why Catholics have reason to complain in regard to public institutions, 196; Governor Cornell forbids religious liberty to Catholics in New York, 197; England's legislation on this subject, 198; The States have need to follow her example, 199; Attempted improvements in Ohio and Kentucky, 200; Practice and law at variance in Pennsylvania, 202; A similar state of affairs in Massachusetts, 204; Religious tyranny in New Jersey and other parts of the Union, 205; The rights which Catholics claim, 206; An amendment that should be pressed in Congress, 207; Else trouble will continue, 208.

MODERN SPIRITISM VERSUS CHRISTIANITY. By *Rev. J. F. X. Hœffer, S.J.*, 208

Modern Spiritism an enemy of Christianity, 208; Its origin and progress exclusively American, 209; Inherent defects to which its success is due, 210; Its influence extends far beyond the ignorant and unreasoning, 212; Spiritism and Materialism as enemies, 213; Scientific investigation of its supposed phenomena, 214; Result of Mr. Wallace's inquiries, 216; The physical as distinct from the intellectual phenomena of Spiritism, 217; Considerations on these latter, 218; Spiritist and other revelations, 219; Spiritism no friend of Christianity, 220; The place of God and the Saviour in Spiritism, 221; Its moral teachings, 222.

PAGE

THE EXISTENCE OF GOD DEMONSTRATED. ON WHAT GROUNDS DOES THE ATHEIST DENY THE EXISTENCE OF GOD? (FOURTH AND CONCLUDING ARTICLE.) By *Rev. J. Ming, S.J.*, ... 223

Error under the appearance of truth, 223; Transcendental criticism as a foundation for Atheism, 224; What empiricism and sensationalism have to do with it, 225; Spiritual faculties of the soul as bearing on the existence of God, 226; Does sensationalism give a firm basis to objections? 227; Sensationalists contradict their fundamental tenets, 229; The intellect as an immaterial faculty, 230; From ideas the mind proceeds to knowledge, 231; All empiricists not Atheists, 233; The only way to escape universal skepticism, 234; Empiricism contradicts its own principles, 235; The only course left open to empiricists, 236; The positivists gainsay their theories in many respects, 237; Materialism as a support to Atheism, 238; Impossible powers attributed to matter, 240; Living beings and matter, 241; Atheistic systems degrade man, 243; Modern systems compared with the Scholastic philosophy, 244.

"THE NEW FRENCH MINISTER OF PUBLIC INSTRUCTION." A REPLY TO THE "HARPERS" LATEST CALUMNY. By *Rev. Aug. J. Thebaud, S.J.*, 245

M. Paul Bert's brief term in office, 245; Effect of his furious onslaught on the Church, 246; Deference to Catholic Bishops, 247; M. Bert's position as a scientist in France, 248; The famous "seventh" clause, 249; M. Bert on the teachings of the Jesuits, 250; Charges and replies, 251; Clement XIV and the Jesuits, 253; The Jesuits and the French parliaments, 253; "Jesuit Immorality," 255; Gury's "Moral Theology," 257; Cases in point, 258; Some of these on their merits, 261; The question of lying, 262; The Jesuits and Communism, 265; Dispute about secret compensation, 267; False swearing, dealing with heretics, natural afflictions, 269; "Harper's Monthly Magazine" not a safe guide in matters of Catholic doctrine, 270.

AN IRISH GOVERNMENT FOR IRELAND. By *John Boyle O'Reilly*, . . 270

Adverse opinions on a former article, 270; Principles and objects of the Land League, 271; What England really fears from Ireland, 272; The only safe and equitable way to manage the sale of the land of Ireland, 273; How the Land League should be used for further good, 274; The development of manufacturing industries more important than peasant proprietorship, 275; Other sources of Ireland's wealth besides her minerals, 276; Ireland must demand and get her own parliament, 277; Parnell, the needed leader, in prison, 278.

THE PRACTICE OF SHAVING IN THE LATIN CHURCH. By *Most Rev. Charles J. Seghers, D.D.*, ... 278

Usefulness and interest of this subject, 278; The legislation of Moses and the discipline of the Eastern Church on the beard, 279; Difference of discipline between the Greeks and Latins, 281; Sts. Clement of Alexandria and Epiphanius on shaving, 283; Origin of the practice of shaving, 284; Scarcity of beards in Rome, 287; How St. Peter and St. Paul differed on this point, 289; Antiquity and universality of shaving, 290; Interesting details gathered from councils and individuals, 292; A pen picture of Pope St. Gregory the Great's personal appearance, 294; Arguments in favor of the custom of shaving, 295; Further demonstration of the practice in the Latin Church, 298; Instructions to a western ambassador going to Constantinople, 301; Special mention of the regular clergy, 302; Innovation of beard-growing by Julius II, 304; Ordinances of St. Charles Borromeo, 305; Mystical significations of shaving, 307; Object of the foregoing considerations, 309.

THE PAPACY AND THE EUROPEAN POWERS. 1870–1882. By *John MacCarthy*. 311

The changes of ten years between Rome and the powers, 311; The Congress of Vienna repudiated, 312; The Law of Guarantees a mistake of the Italian government, 313; Napoleon, Bismark, and the Pope, 315; Papal Infallibility incensing the powers, 316; The Papacy's prospects look the gloomiest, 317; Prince Bismarck in his glory, 318; Pius IX. gives the world's rulers timely warning, 319; What came of Bismarck's triumph, 320; Rise of Socialism in Germany, 321; Bismarck getting embarrassed, 322; Compelled to fall back on the Catholics for aid, 324; The Pope pointing out to the nations the road to safety, 325; Difficulties to the powers arising from the seizure of Rome, 326; The necessity of Catholic life as a social defense, 328; The whole question briefly stated, 329; The Pope's imprisonment drawing to a close, 330.

THE MONKS OF OLD. By *Rev. Edward F. X. McSweeny, D.D.*, . . . 331

Antiquity of the institution of Monasticism, 331; The great Barbarian irruption, 332; St. Benedict and other recluses, 333; Sketch of the recluse of Subiaco, 334; Remnants of Paganism, 335; His later history, 336; The longing for the spiritual life, 337; The counsels of poverty, chastity and obedience, 339; Celibacy among others than priests and monks, 340; Good results of poverty and obedience, 341; Power which the monks derived from these practices, 342; Their life a protest against lawlessness, violence and sin, 343; The position to which the Church has elevated woman, 344; External influence of the monks, 345.

ENGLANDS RETURN TO THE FAITH. By *John Charles Earle, B.A., Oxon.*, . 346

Conversion of John Henry Newman, 346; Those who followed him into the Church, 347; Ameliorated condition of the Catholics, 348; The chief convert before Newman,

PAGE

349; Speedy answers to the prayers of faith, 350; Father Ignatius Spencer's great influence, 351; The changes of the last forty years, 352; The Catholic religion's foes, 353; Views of Catholic prelates and physicists, 355; The advantage of contrasting the past with the present, 356; Hope for the conversion of England, 357; Cardinal Newman's reception at the Duke of Norfolk's, 360; The respect in which he is held by non-Catholics, 361; Catholic statistics, 362; Unfavorable view of England's conversion, 364; Reasons for not despairing of a national return to the faith, 365; Cardinal Newman on the conversion of England, 368; Numerous admissions made by enemies of the Church, 369; Recapitulation, 370.

THE CINCINNATI PASTORAL AND ITS CRITICS, ... 371

Real meaning and scope of the Pastoral, 371; The passages which have excited most comment, 372; The necessity for there being rulers and ruled, 373; Why the Council deserves the thanks of every American citizen, 374.

WHAT IS THE OUTLOOK FOR OUR COLLEGES? 385

Colleges viewed from a Protestant standpoint, 385; Mediæval Oxford and Cambridge, 386; What our modern Catholic Colleges have to do, 387; Circumstances in which they exist, 388; Catholic Colleges the cherished objects of the Church, 389; Boarding schools necessary in these times, 390; Nature and outcome of the work done in a well-disciplined college, 391; The discipline of our colleges, 392; Number of our colleges, 393; They must be neither mercenary, nor improvident, nor extravagant, 394; The question of endowment, 395; Their good order ought to be diffused throughout the land, 397; A system very degrading to Catholic education, 398; Our colleges have become more Catholic, 399; Reasons why Catholics need never dread the light, 401; Man's religious in relation to his rational nature, 402; Importance of the study of religion, 403; Intellectual characteristics of our age, 404; Lack of the right kind of text-books, 405; The promiscuous reading of a book like Mr. Mallock's "Is Life Worth Living?" not enough for Catholics, 406.

KING JAMES I, OF ENGLAND. By *R. M. Johnston*, ... 407

Reverence of Protestant youth for the first Stuart King of England, 407; His unnatural conduct towards his mother, 408; How he came to the throne of Scotland, 409; Mary Stuart as Elizabeth's prisoner, 410; Neglected by her son, 411; What followed her death, 412; The King of Scotland repeatedly insulted by the Queen of England, 413; How her death affected him, 414; He becomes even more contemptible as King of England, 415; His relations with Puritanism, 416; The Bible bearing his name, 417; The Gunpowder Plot, 418; Nothing to admire in him as a sovereign, 419; His reputation for wisdom, 420; He could not help having dishonest ministers, 422; Semerset's influence over him in his old age, 424; Last days of a mean life, 425.

ROBERT SOUTHWELL. By *Joseph A. Nolan, Ph.D.*, ... 426

A voluntary mission of danger undertaken by Southwell, 426; What he regarded as a misuse of talent in England, 427; Facts of his life as connected with his writings, 428; His entrance into the priesthood, 429; Jesuits in England in the time of Elizabeth, 431; How, as a priest, he had to live in his native country, 432; He was always in danger of arrest, 435; Length and success of his labors, 436; He is captured and confesses his mission, 437; How he was treated as a prisoner, 438; When his poems were composed, 439; Spending nearly three years in the Tower, 440; His charity towards those engaged in his trial, 441; How he met death, 442; Southwell's writings have always been regarded with favor, 443; Merits of both his prose and poetical writings, 444; Samples of his poetry, 447; He was the born poet, 450; His Latin poems, 453; Faults of his style, 454; His place in literature, 455.

GARIBALDI AND THE REVOLUTION IN ITALY. By *John MacCarthy*, . . 456

A clique of conspirators, 456; Character of the career of Garabaldi, 457; The true measure of the man, 458; Complications of Italian history, 459; What manner of man Mazzini was, 460; Garibaldi's adventurous career, 461; King Charles Albert and the Revolution, 462; Events in Europe during Garibaldi's absence in America, 463; The Roman revolution of 1848, 464; Piedmont and Austria, 466; Abdication of Charles Albert, 467; Relations of Victor Emmanuel and Cavour with the Catholic Church, 468; Cavour's puppets, 469; The war of 1859 with Austria, 470; How Italy has become what it is, 471.

PROTESTANT CHURCHES AND CHURCH-GOERS. By *John Gilmary Shea, LL.D.*, 472

Obligation of Church-going among Protestants, 472; Marked decline of Protestant Church life, 473; Statistics taken in Philadelphia, 474; Figures from Boston and other cities, 475; Protestant Church extension carried beyond the limits of necessity, 476; Standard of the Protestant clergy much lower than it was, 477; Origin and meaning of the proposition to tax Churches, 478; Opposition to the Church bell, 479; Public worship among Protestants, 480; What true worship is, 482; Adequacy of Catholic worship, 484; Protestantism the greatest anomaly on earth, 485; What may be done with its deserted churches, 486.

NEARING THE TRUE POLE. By *A. de G.*, ... 487

Explorations in the sphere of religion, 487; Herbert Spencer and newly discovered truths, 489; True meaning of religion, 490; Religion as a crying want of human nature, 491; Meaning of the terms "right" and "wrong," 492; Tests of the intrinsic

PAGE

merit of human conduct, 493; Things overlooked by evolution and sociology, 494; How sociologists regard the influence of Christianity on human society, 496; Evil effect of the doctrine of scientific ethics on our age, 498; The ground on which scientists stand not unassailable, 499; Narrowing down the field of religion, 500; The good done by the investigation as to the nature of true religion, 501.

THE DECLINE OF PAINTING AS A FINE ART. By *Arthur Waldon*, . . 503

The small quantity of real soul in our modern pictures, 503; Hardly any country an exception, 504; How the decline is accounted for, 505; The blame erroneously laid on the Catholic Church, 506; The historical relation which art bears to religion, 508; Elements necessary to the perfection of a painting, 509; How noble feelings are awakened, 510; The deterioration of high art is due to the motives of the artists, 512; Before art is again improved, society must be christianized, 513; Overbeck and his work, 514; The opportunities for improvement Catholics in this country have, 515; The principal motive that should prompt art education, 516; The opportunity that fine art affords for making Catholic truth known and loved, 517.

THE DEISTIC REVELATION OF SPIRITISM. By *Rev. J. F. X. Hœffer, S.J.*, . 518

What reason tells us of the revelation that comes from God, 518; How we can determine its origin, 519; The rational basis upon which Christian revelation stands, 520; The philosophy of revelation, 521; What the revelation of a spirit or a man is, 522; Spirits on spirits, 524; They neglect the high criterion of logic, 526; A gratuitous assumption by the spiritists, 527; The Christian argument against spiritists is simply the revealed truth, 528; A close inspection of the statements of the spirits, 529; How the spirits try to drag down the soul of man, 530; The "moral teaching of Spiritism," 532; Hideous character and statements of the spirits, 534; Revelations of the spirits concerning the God-head, 536; Christian Revelation contradicting every spiritist statement about God, 537; The revelations and marvels of the spirits only the manifestation of the powers of darkness, 538; Spiritism furnishes no explanation of Christian revelation, 539.

MICHAEL DAVITT'S SCHEME FOR NATIONALIZING THE LAND. By *George D. Wolff*, ... 541

The effects of seven centuries of misrule in Ireland, 541; The Irish cause in recent years and the great danger that threatens it, 542; Faults of Mr. Davitt's plan, 543; Objections to it in its first form, 544; The scheme looked at from the points of expediency, policy and practicability, 545; Reasons why the scheme is impracticable, 548; Meaning of the phrase "the land for the people," 551; The question of individual ownership, 552; This as related to absolute ownership, 554; Progress of Ireland's prospects within two years, 555; The great danger which imperils the success of Ireland's cause, 556.

CORRESPONDENCE.—RELIGIOUS DISSENSIONS IN ENGLAND.—ANGLICANISM.—RITUALISM.—SCEPTICISM. By *an Oxford Graduate*, . . . 557

THE ORIGIN OF CIVIL AUTHORITY. By *Rev. J. Ming, S.J.*, . . . 577

Criminal acts against those in power, 577; The Church and the necessity of civil authority, 578; Authority necessary to society, 579; Nature, properties and functions of civil authority, 580; Inquiry into its origin, 581; The Reformation as against the authority of the Church, 582; The political theories of Hobbes and Locke, 584; That of Montesquieu, 585; Authority and the idealism of Kant and Fichte, 587; Schelling's system, 588; Hegel's and socialism, 589; Rousseau as the inspirer of Jefferson, 590; Brownson on political systems, 591; Atheism and political writers, 592; Unity never produced by authority of merely human origin, 593; This remark as applied to the United States, 595; Relation of tyranny to the different systems, 596; They place material force over moral power, 597; Such theories and the dignity of our free rational nature, 599; A glance at the present condition of society, 600.

CARDINAL NEWMAN AS A MAN OF LETTERS. By *John Charles Earle, B.A., Oxon.*, ... 601

Disraeli and Newman, 601; The Cardinal's early life, 602; His associates at the time he took his degree, 603; Newman as a preacher, 604; The "Tracts for the Times," 606; A characteristic poem, 607; Influence of Newman's poetry, 608; "Lyra Apostolica," and "Dream of Gerontius," 609; Newman's Philosophical writings, 611; The Cardinal as an apologist of Christianity, 612; His "Essay on Development," 614; His novels "Loss and Gain," and "Callista," 615; Pictures of the early Church, 616; A similitude of Oxford life, 618; Newman's ability as an ecclesiastical historian, 620; His sketch of Arianism and the sects that sprang from it, 621; His other historical writings, 623; In what he regards a university education to consist, 624; The opponents of Christian education, 625; The work of Newman's later life, 627; The title and office of Cardinal, 628; "Select Treatises" of Athanasius against the Arians, 630; Opinions on Newman's publications, 631.

CESARE CANTÙ AND THE NEO-GUELPHS OF ITALY. By *Rev. Bernard O'Reilly, L.D.*, ... 632

Extent and value of Cesare Cantù's historical labors, 632; A new edition of his "Universal History," 633; Religious memories that entered Cantù's young mind, 634; Struggles of early life, 635; Manzoni and Cantù as defenders of the Church, 636; Mazzini's Young Italy, 637; Cantù is persecuted by the Austrian authorities, 638; Necessity spurring his literary efforts, 640; His books for youth and other treatises,

PAGE

641; The "Universal History," and how it was received by friend and foe, 642; An Austrian official conspiracy against Cantù, 643; The Revolution of 1848 in Northern Italy, 644; The plan of a Republican Confederated Italy, 645; Cantù on Italian liberty, 646; Mazzinian conspiracy against the Neo-Guelphs, 649; King Carlalberto becomes the victim of his revolutionary friends, 650; The Revolution triumphant, but Cantù ever faithful, 651.

THE ATTITUDE OF SOCIETY TOWARDS RELIGION. By *Arthur Featherstone Marshall, B.A., Oxon.*, ... 652

The different kinds of Society, 652; Faults of both the old and the new regime in France, 654; Shortcomings of Italian Society, 655; Religious privilege as a tool of Society, 656; What Society in Anglicanism is responsible for, 657; The Popes on social decadence, 658; Example has a better effect on the people than precept, 659; Despotism of Society, 660; A hideous fallacy in the popular mind, 661; The sentiment of the revolutionists towards Society, 663; It is the cowardice of Society that causes the evils, 664.

AMERICAN FREETHINKING, ... 665

Unprogressiveness of American freethinking, 665; Americans not an investigating people, 666; The infidel's erroneous conception of the God he denies, 667; Protestantism as a promoter of infidelity, 668; Shortcomings of American freethinking, 669; Our system of public education as an ally of infidelity, 670; Denials prompted by fears, 671; The infidel mode of warfare and how Catholics should meet it, 672.

SUPERIOR INSTRUCTION IN OUR COLLEGES. By *Rev. Aug. J. Thebaud, S.J.*, 673

Two important recent utterances on this subject, 673; Americans forget the development of the mind in its higher aspirations, 674; Importance of high studies for the ruling classes, 675: Culture as a ruling force among the ancients, 676; The Church still holds the lead in the intellectual sphere, 677; Scholastic studies derided by the humanists and Protestants, 678; The higher studies in America, 679; The first Catholic colleges here, 681; Causes of inability in colleges to rise, 682; Whether pretensions are warranted, 683; Want of adequate preparation for college studies, 684; Too many subjects taught and discussed, 685; A great drawback in education as regards fine writing, 686; Too much study for too short a time, 687; A quotation from a former article, 688; Text-books and specific articles for Catholics to study, 689; How much education is needed by the enlightened portion of a community, 690; Under what circumstances a Catholic university would be required, 691; Proportions of the superior instruction now aimed at, 692; Means for a Catholic to complete his education, 693; The branches of a thorough education, 694; Difficulties of detail of the project of a complete university, 696; The Catholic side of great questions in discussion, 698; An apt quotation from Donoso Cortes, 699.

LABOR DISCONTENT. By *John Gilmary Shea, LL.D.*, ... 700

Political economy and the labor question, 700; Failure of all writers on the subject, 701; Trades unions and strikes, 702; The Catholic priesthood in the labor troubles, 703; Want of Catholic influence in legislative assemblies and the press, 704; Influences of a Spanish bishop and an American one, 705; Confused views of a new school's representative, 706; Disintegrating effect of Protestant teaching and theory, 707; Is the artisan class unthrifty and extravagant? 708; The temperance question as bearing on it, 709; The question of insufficient wages, 710; No strikes, and the just remuneration of labor, 711.

THE COMING TRANSIT OF VENUS. By *Rev. J. M. Degni, S.J.*, ... 712

The constant demand for more accurate astronomical knowledge, 712; Difficulties the astronomer has to encounter, 713; How far difficulties have been reduced, 714; Dates of occurrence of the transit of Venus, 715; Explanation of the solar parallax, 716; Halley's investigations, 717; His accurate foreknowledge of transits of Venus, 718; Method of observation proposed by the French astronomer, Delisle, 719; Halley's modified method, 720; Another and a new method, 721; Halley's and Delisle's methods used together, 723; Difficulties rendering observations doubtful, 723; Determination of the velocity of light, 724; What our astronomers did at the last transit, 725; Great advantage of the photographic method, 726; All the methods used in 1874, 727; Selection of suitable places for observations, 728; Results expected from investigations of the coming transit, 729.

ENGLAND'S LATEST CONQUEST, ... 730

Characteristics of Egyptian history and Mehemet Ali, 730; Recent English and French influences in Egypt, 731; The revolt of Arabi Bey and his followers, 732; The Suez Canal difficulty and beginning of the war, 733; The conference of the Powers at Constantinople, 734; General Wolseley's conduct of the campaign in Egypt, 735; His activity leaves the sage debaters at Constantinople stranded, 736; England now sure of her pathway to India, 736; How the Egyptian question now stands, 737; Remaining difficulties of the situation, 738.

IRISH CRIME AND ITS CAUSES. By *John MacCarthy*, ... 738

The present lull in Irish affairs, 738; Feeling over the Phœnix murders, 739: Less crime in Ireland than in Great Britain, 740; The Land League and the Arrears Act, 741; Murders in the West, 742; The system of government in Ireland essentially bad, 743; A splendid opportunity for Mr. Gladstone to reconcile the Irish people, 744.

BOOK NOTICES.

Appleton's Standard System of Penmanship, 192
A Saint among Saints..... 576

Balmes's The Art of Thinking Well..... 189
Beard's Psychology of the Salem Witchcraft, 576
Bigelow's Molinos the Quietist..... 571
Brann's Spirituality and Immortality of the Human Soul..... 575

Coleridge's The Prisoners of the King..... 190
Cook's Scientific Culture..... 175
Copecelatro's Life of St. Philip Neri..... 761

De Vere's Foray of Queen Meave..... 765
Dictionary of Education and Instruction..... 574
Devoy's The Land of Eire..... 768

Essays on the Floating Matter of the Air..... 576

Gaume's Life of the Good Thief..... 564
Gibson's Catechism made Easy..... 572
Girls' Book of Piety..... 574
Gother's Instructions for Particular States and Conditions of Life..... 575
Gurteen's Handbook of Charity Organization, 379

Haberl's Epitome ex Graduali Romano..... 384
Hoffman's Aunt Olive..... 573
Holy Exercise of the Presence of God.. 576

Icasbalceta's De la Destruction de Antiguedades Mexicanas..... 169
Idols: or the Secret of the Rue de la Chaussee d'Antin..... 574
Illustrated Catholic Family Annual for 1882, 192

Jackson's The Fathers of the Third Century, 182
John Inglesant—A Romance..... 758

Kenny's Half Hours with the Saints..... 568

Lanigan's Science and Skepticism..... 381
Lasserre's, Bernadette, Sister Marie Bernard, 567
Leaves from the Annals of the Sisters of Mercy..... 192
Lecky's England in the Eighteenth Century, 560
Lexique de la Langue Iroquoise..... 767
Life of St. Francis Xavier..... 375
Lloyd's Saints of 1881..... 575

McCallen's Sanctuary Boys' Manual..... ... 179
MacCarthy's History of the World..... 755
Maples's Life of St. Frederick..... 576
Masson's Compendious French Dictionary.... 575
Monell's The Creation and the Scripture..... 576
Moriarty's All for Love..... 382
Morse's John Quincy Adams..... 749

Names that Live in Catholic Hearts..... 573
Novena in Honor of St. Teresa..... 768

Officium Majoris Hebdomadæ..... 384
Orsini's History of the B. V. Mary..... 763

Pergmayer's The Truths of Salvation..... 766
Poems by James Clarence Mangan..... 184
Poems by John B. Tabb..... 573
Preston's Protestantism and the Church..... 377

Ryder's Household Library of Catholic Poets, 188

Saint Jure's The Religious..... 569
S. Alphonsi M. de Liguori de Ceremoniis Missæ..... 572
Segur on Confession..... 575
Seton's Essays on Various Subjects..... 571
Seven Voices of Sympathy from Longfellow, 191
Shields's Order of the Sciences..... 576
Skeat's Etymological Dictionary..... 570
Smith's Elements of Ecclesiastical Law..... 746
Soldiers' Companion to the Spiritual Exercises..... 576
Spalding's Lectures and Discourses..... 566
Steward's Stories of Christian Schools..... 574
St. Teresa of Jesus, The Wonders of the Heart of..... 768
Studies in Science and Religion..... 767
Sullivan's Irish Agitation..... 171

Taylor's Anthropology..... 569
Taylor's A Sure Way to a Happy Marriage... 191
The Faith of the World 570
Trench's Realities of Irish Life..... 563

Ullathorne's Groundwork of the Christian Virtues..... 764

Venillot's Stephaine..... 572

Weninger's Practical Sermons..... .....186, 384

THE AMERICAN CATHOLIC

QUARTERLY REVIEW.

VOL. VII.—JANUARY, 1882.—No. 25.

METHODISM AND ITS METHODS.

History of the Methodist Episcopal Church in the United States, embracing also a Sketch of the Rise of Methodism in Europe, and of its Origin and Progress in Canada. By Rev. P. Douglass Gorrie. New York, R. Worthington, 1881. 12mo., 359 pp.

A Comprehensive History of Methodism. In one volume. Embracing Origin, Progress, and Present Spiritual, Educational and Benevolent Status in all Lands. By James Porter, D.D. Cincinnati, Hitchcock & Walden, 1876. 12mo., 601 pp.

THE Methodist Church in this country, and its general relation to our institutions have not been sufficiently studied. Strange in its origin, its organization, its methods, it began its labors among the poorest and least enlightened portion of the community, but now in the tide of its prosperity claims nearly two millions of members, and shows an ambition for power through the general and local governments that is unexampled in our national history, and in itself a matter of serious concern.

Methodism in America recognizes as its founder, apostle, and legislator the Rev. John Wesley, who lived and died a recognized clergyman of the Established Church of England, presenting thus the strange spectacle of a man professing one religion and establishing another. In his time the Reformation had worked out its fruit in Great Britain. "The religion of the kingdom was a religion of mere forms and ceremonies, of prayers, fasts, and thanksgivings; while Sabbath-breaking, drunkenness, licentiousness, gambling, hunting, etc., were not only permitted, but openly practiced by the clergy of the Established Church. So greatly

indeed had true religion declined after the Reformation, that Archbishop Leighton in speaking of the Church in his time represents it as a 'carcass without a spirit,' and Bishop Burnet represents the clergy of his times as having 'less authority and more contempt than those of any other Church in Europe,' as 'more remiss in their labors and less severe in their lives,' and such was the fact at the beginning of the labors of the Wesleys and their co-laborers. Darkness,—moral, spiritual, doctrinal,—covered the people."

With such a result a Catholic may well ask whether a reformation that bore such fruits could have been the work of God? Certainly the persecuted Catholic clergy and laity of England cannot be accused in any such terms.

The condition in the British colonies in America was even worse. It is now the custom to throw a religious varnish over the spiritual condition of the colonists; but no student of history is ignorant how subordinate a place religion generally occupied. We hear on every side platitudes about the Pilgrim Fathers of Plymouth, yet who ever stops to note the fact that the colonists in the Mayflower came unattended by any minister of religion, and had for a time no recognized religious worship. The Protestant settlers in Virginia were almost destitute of ministers; those in Maryland were for years and years in a similar condition, so that most of them in time placed themselves under the ministrations of men who showed such purity of life and such devotion to duty as the early Catholic missionaries of Maryland. When Protestant clergy did come they were so far from imitating the self-sacrificing priests, that during an epidemic they shrank from attending their own flocks, and actually appealed to the legislature to pass laws to punish the Catholic clergy for responding to the calls of those who sought the consolations of religion at their hands. Dr. Coke, an associate of Wesley, and like him to the last a recognized minister of the Church of England, says, "that the churches in America were in general filled with the parasites and bottle-companions of the rich and great," and that, with few exceptions, "they were the most wretched set of men that ever disgraced the Church of God."

John Wesley, the son of a clergyman of the Church of England, was born in 1703, and became a student at Oxford at the age of seventeen. He was evidently superior to those around him in religious feeling and a sense of the deplorable spiritual state of England; but he went on, took orders, and became his father's curate. In all probability he would have done no more than sigh over human depravity, but for the influence of his brother Charles, who remained at Oxford, and formed a little society. "Diligence led me into serious thinking," says Charles Wesley. "I went to the weekly Sacrament and persuaded two or three young scholars to

accompany me; and likewise to observe the *method* of study prescribed by the statutes of the University. This gained me the harmless nickname of Methodist." Returning to Oxford, John Wesley joined this little band, and the two brothers, both ordained, declined preferments, and preached wherever they could, visiting prisons and the poor.

The brothers read Catholic works, and seemed to have caught some ideas of the missionary spirit. Of this we can see many traces. The *Following of Christ* was one of the books Wesley circulated among his followers. For St. Francis Xavier and his wonderful labors he entertained the highest respect, and abridged lives of the Apostle of the Indies were constantly in the hands of the early Methodists. Another personage whose life made an impression on the founder of Methodism was the Venerable Gregory Lopez, a holy hermit in Mexico, whose canonization was solicited by the Church in New Spain, and by the Catholic monarch. His life, too, circulated among Methodists, and it is somewhat curious that in the early part of this century this holy Catholic of our neighboring republic was far better known among Protestants in this country than among Catholics.

The system of missions given by St. John Francis Regis, St. Vincent de Paul, St. Francis de Hieronymo, and by the Jesuits and Lazarists generally, was evidently studied by Wesley as the best mode of reaching the neglected classes in England, and arousing them to a knowledge and love of God. It seems strange that the grace of God did not lead him back to the bosom of the Church in which he found spiritual life, and the preaching of the gospel to the poor, so different from the apathy and remissness of his own, but unfortunately the prejudices in which he was reared formed an impenetrable veil over his heart. Despite the evidence before him he was rabidly unjust and bitter against the Church.

The Anglican Establishment, creature and slave of the state, had no field for him. To it he was simply a nuisance, unnecessarily troubling its somnolent ease. As Macaulay remarks, it showed most strikingly in this case its utter inability to use the services of earnest and devoted men for its work. In the Catholic Church he would have become the head of a great corps of missionaries in an order already recognized, or in a congregation founded by himself to meet the wants of the time. He neither became a Catholic to labor in the cause of truth, nor grew to be a bulwark and stay of the Church of England, but simply added one more to the list of rash and daring men who have assumed an office that only a direct commission from God can authorize, that of founders of religious denominations.

Finding no immediate field in England, he accepted an invita-

tion from General Oglethorpe to go to Georgia as a missionary, and persuaded his brother Charles to accompany him. They arrived in 1736, and commenced their labors, the amiable and poetic Charles, adding to his clerical duties, the civil offices of secretary to Mr. Oglethorpe and Secretary of Indian Affairs, unwittingly giving a precedent to the Methodist clergy of our time to combine ministerial duties and office-holding, yet after all a precedent more to be honored in the breach than the observance. The stay of the brothers in the new colony was neither long nor happy. Charles, after bitter persecution, returned to England, and was, before long, followed by his brother. Both, during their stay in America, showed themselves most strenuous upholders of the Church of England, insisting to the letter on all its rites and ceremonies, and refusing all communion with dissenters. John Wesley did not leave Georgia till he had been arraigned on a series of charges arising out of his strict views of prelacy, and the last of these indictments against the future founder of the Methodist religion and church accused him "of being regarded by all persons of any consideration as a Roman Catholic." This was by no means a trivial affair at that time, for Oglethorpe himself within two or three years from that date, by exciting similar suspicions in New York, sent the innocent non-juror, Rev. John Ury, to the gallows.

Returning to England Wesley resumed his former career, influenced somewhat by the Moravians and their school of German mysticism; and to imbibe still more fully their spirit, he visited Herrnhut. Protestantism had rejected the "ministry of reconciliation" confided by Christ to his apostles when he said to them: "Whose sins you shall forgive, they are forgiven them." With Protestants therefore absolution was to be pronounced, not by a priest under the power given by Christ, but by the individual himself under no authority but his own. Adopting the theory put forward by Christ's enemies—"Who can forgive sins but God alone," they insisted that sins were to be confessed to God only; but as God does not thereupon by any angel or other ministry assure the penitent whether his sins are forgiven or retained, the sinner has no means of ascertaining this vital fact. Calvinism will tell him that if he is one of the elect his sins are forgiven; if one of the reprobate, they are not. Each one, therefore, absolves himself or gives way to despair, as he believes or disbelieves in his election. The mystics, whose ideas Wesley adopted, insisted that there must be some interior movement of the soul to give the sinner assurance of his pardon. When he experienced this he could pronounce himself absolved. That our Lord is nowhere recorded as having laid down such a system, but plainly contradicts it by

giving the pardoning power to his apostles, seems to have weighed lightly with men who professed to draw all their doctrines from Scripture. This self-absolution from sin, on what may be a mere delusion, is however the corner-stone of Wesley's system. When John Wesley at last felt the assurance that he could pronounce himself absolved from sin, he was to his own mind fully empowered to guide mankind in the true way of salvation, so that he stood forth not only self-absolved but self-ordained to convert and save the world.

On the 1st of May, 1738, forty or fifty of his followers agreed to meet with him every Wednesday evening in order to engage in free conversation, begun and ended with singing and prayer. Though ministers of the Church of England the Wesleys and Whitefield had no positions, and few friends among the clergy of the Establishment. The churches were not open to them to preach. For a time they preached in the open air, but as some permanent place would be required, the corner-stone of the first Methodist meeting-house was laid in May, 1739. For a time there were certain affiliations with the Moravians, but Wesley soon cut loose from them; then Whitefield and others who leaned to Calvin's theory of predestination drew off, and John Wesley was left to mould his followers and be moulded by them. Though disowned by his own Church he clung to it, formally disavowed all intention of separating from it, and maintained the necessity of her orders for lawful preaching or ministry. As some of his lay followers set up ere long as preachers, he was forced to yield on that point, because he knew that no bishop in England would ordain these fervent but unlettered men. Gradually, however, other ministers of the Church of England joined him, and in 1744 Methodism counted as its clergy six of these, who held at that time the first conference recognized by Methodist annals. For years they labored, spreading to Ireland and Scotland, meeting strong opposition and not unfrequently violence, but gaining in numbers and strength, although some dissensions arose, and occasionally numbers would leave, either from a preference for Calvinism or from fear of separation from the Established Church.

In the conference of 1771 there were one hundred and twenty-five preachers, and Methodism claimed thirty thousand members. At this meeting Francis Asbury and Richard Wright offered to go to America to begin the work beyond the Atlantic, and their offer was accepted. Yet at this time and later Wesley clung to the Established Church; his meetings were not held at the time of its services, which he attended himself, and urged his followers to attend, as he required them to receive communion there at the hands of the Anglican clergy. When they were repelled, he and

the other ordained ministers in his society administered communion; but where his lay preachers attempted to do so he checked them.

Wesleyanism came to America not as a new denomination, but as a movement in the Church of England, adhering to its orders, its ministry, and its doctrine. In America it found a new and broader field. The people in many of the colonies where the Anglican Church was established by law, were almost utterly neglected, with few clergymen, and still fewer of them zealous, and not a single bishop in the length or breadth of the Colonies, so little had the Church in England or its crowned head cared for its organization or extension in America.

Methodism had, however, preceded the advent of these envoys. Among the emigrants who drifted over from Ireland in 1760 was Philip Embury, a carpenter, who had been a local preacher. Roused by Barbara Heck, a Palatine, he began to preach in his house on Barrack Street (Park Place), New York, his first congregation numbering only five persons. Some years after Captain Thomas Webb, of the British army, who had been a local preacher in England, but was stationed at Albany as barrack-master, joined Embury in his labors. The congregation increased so that in 1768 a chapel was erected in John Street.

Others who had joined the Methodists in England or Ireland seem about the same time to have begun preaching in different parts, gathering little flocks to listen to their homely, but earnest and impassioned appeals. The arrival of Wesley's envoys gave life and unity to these little bodies. Other preachers followed, and Methodist itinerants traversed all parts of the country. The Colonies were, however, in the heat of the great poltical controversy which was soon to result in an appeal to arms. Wesley took strong ground against the Colonies, and wrote a violent denunciation of their cause. His preachers in America were nearly all from England and Ireland, all Tories in inclination, and the flocks they had gathered were mainly of the same political leaning. The Methodist body cannot lay claim to a single member of the Continental Congress, or a single man prominent in the defence of American liberty. Still adhering in form to the Established Church of England, they were as zealous upholders of the British crown and supremacy. Indeed, one of their body, whom they now try to repudiate, was killed while raising a Tory regiment. But though some of the preachers returned to England, others remained, and kept the work alive within the British lines and in less disturbed parts of the country.

The close of the Revolution brought up the grave question, what was to be done to maintain their system. The Church of

England had never had bishops in America, and though many of its adherents in Virginia and elsewhere, like Washington himself, had been the stanchest of patriots, public feeling was not favorable to it. From the Anglican clergy in America the Methodists could, judging from the past, expect no fellowship. Methodism had already in America an organization of its own, its conferences, its itinerant preachers, and had already shown its strong hand by suppressing one of the enterprising members who attempted to print Methodist books on his own account. It was a religion without a creed and without a ministry of its own, without a form of worship. John Wesley resolved to manufacture them for the American market. Falling back on Lord King's *Account of the Primitive Church* he maintained that bishops and presbyters were the same order, and consequently had the same right to ordain. He had never exercised the right in England, for he adds "here there are bishops who have a legal jurisdiction. In America there are none, neither any parish ministers. . . . Here, therefore, my scruples are at end." "*I* have accordingly appointed Dr. Coke and Mr. Francis Asbury to be joint superintendents over our brethren in North America; as also Richard Whatcoat and Thomas Vasey to act as elders among them by baptizing and administering the Lord's supper. And I have prepared a Liturgy little differing from that of the Church of England (I think the best constituted national Church in the world)."

Of this assumption of power by his brother, Charles Wesley, in a letter to Dr. Chandler in America, says: "I can scarcely yet believe that in his eighty-second year, my brother, my old intimate friend and companion, should have assumed the Episcopal character, ordained elders, consecrated a bishop, and sent him to ordain the lay preachers in America. I was then in Bristol at his elbow, yet he never gave me the least hint of his intention. How was he surprised into so rash an action? He certainly persuaded himself that it was right. Lord Mansfield told me last year that ordination was separation! This my brother does not and will not see; or that he has renounced the principles and practice of his whole life; that he has acted contrary to all his declarations, protestations, and writings; robbed his friends of their boasting; realized the Nag's Head ordination, and left an indelible blot on his name as long as it shall be remembered."

The amended Liturgy has vanished utterly; it is merely a curiosity of the past, like Benjamin Franklin's amended Book of Common Prayer. The twenty-four Articles of Faith which Wesley gave in his book have, however, been retained, with the addition of one more relating to civil rulers, intended, doubtless, in 1784, to

relieve American Methodists from the charge of disaffection to the government of the United States.

Mr. Wesley himself subscribed to the Thirty-nine Articles of the Church of England, was a minister of that Church, and as such ordained Dr. Coke by imposition of hands and prayer, claiming through its orders apostolic succession, yet he deliberately rejects fifteen of the articles which he had frequently subscribed! They retained, however, the strange statement in regard to the canon of Scripture: "In the name of the Holy Scriptures we do understand those canonical books of the Old and New Testament, of whose authority was never any doubt in the Church;" a statement false in fact and false in logic. False in fact, for doubts existed as to several of the books, and have existed to this day among Anglicans and Methodists. False in logic, for it makes God's act of inspiration depend on man's doubt; and makes a book inspired as long as it is received, and uninspired when doubt arises.

Like all Protestant bodies it maintained that the Scriptures contain all things necessary to salvation, and that no man can be required to believe what is not read therein nor may be proved thereby. Yet in the interpretation of Scripture they worship the mighty "Not," and in the very points where they denounce the Catholic Church, interpret the plain words of Scripture by introducing a negative, while Catholics take the words in their plain and obvious sense.

Thus as to the primacy of Peter: "Thou art Peter (a rock), and on this rock I will build My Church." Protestant interpretation: "I will *not* build My Church." As to the mission of the Apostles: "Go, baptize all nations, teaching them to observe whatsoever I have commanded you." Protestant interpretation: "Not whatsoever I have commanded you, but what is hereafter to be contained in certain writings to be inspired." As to the forgiveness of sins: "Whose sins you shall forgive they are forgiven." Protestant interpretation: "They are not really forgiven." As to the eucharist: "This is My body." Protestant interpretation: "This is *not* really My body."

Wesley clung to the idea of the apostolic succession in the Church of England, and his brother's reference to Nag's Head showed that the question was one they had at heart. Modern Methodists ridicule the idea utterly, and one of the works under review adduces the silly and oft-refuted story of Pope Joan with all imaginable seriousness as an argument against apostolic succession.

The Methodist Church in America was thus created with a hierarchy, bishops, presbyters, and deacons, a liturgy, and creed. Wesley, however, did not use the word bishop, and even wrote

indignantly to Coke for using the word instead of superintendent, but it was a mere quibble, for his meaning was clear.

In spite of this step the division between Episcopalians and Methodists was not absolute. As the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States was organized, the bishops of that body, wiser than those in England, endeavored to secure the earnest Methodist preachers and their followers. Bishop White sought an interview with Wesley in England. "I wished," he notes on the back of a letter from Mr. Wesley, "to have held a conversation with Mr. Wesley concerning his recent system respecting America, . . . but I consider this letter as a civil evasion." Yet Wesley's new bishops in America showed a desire to unite with the Episcopal Church. Writing to Bishop White, Dr. Coke, in 1791, says: "I am not sure but I went farther in the separation of our Church in America than Mr. Wesley, from whom I received my commission, did intend. He did, indeed, solemnly invest me, as far as he had a right to do, with Episcopal authority, but did not intend, I think, that an entire separation should take place. . . . But what can be done for a reunion, which I much wish for, and to accomplish which Mr. Wesley, I have no doubt, would use his influence to the utmost?" "My interest also is not small, and both his and mine would readily and to the utmost be used to accomplish that (to us) very desirable object, if a readiness were shown by the bishops of the Protestant Episcopal Church to reunite." Writing to Bishop Seabury he styles his separation from the Church in England an error which he had recanted, professed the most earnest desire for reunion, and proposed that the two houses of the convocation of the clergy should consent to his and Mr. Asbury's consecration as bishops of the Methodist Society in the Protestant Episcopal Church.

But the blow had been struck, and the Methodist Episcopal Church in America went on to build up its own system of faith, and worship, and discipline. The modes adopted for maintaining the fervor excited by the preaching of the itinerant and other ministers were different from those of other denominations. Members were admitted after a probation, and are liable to expulsion, not only for denying any of the doctrines held by the body or for actual sin, but also for using or dealing in intoxicating liquors, while smuggling and bribery at elections are made special grounds of cutting off a member from that body. Each member is under a class-leader, who has generally twelve committed to his care, and who is appointed by the preacher in charge of the circuit or station. He meets his class weekly, inquires into their spiritual condition, exhorts, reproves, advises as he deems necessary; he collects contributions, and reports to the ministers and stewards. Thus each one is under

direct supervision. The preachers, exhorters, stewards, and class-leaders in each circuit or station meet quarterly for the details of government and as a court of appeal, and fix the amount to be raised for the fuel and table expenses of preacher and presiding elder. Above them was the annual conference, convoked by the bishop, but in which only travelling preachers took part; and every four years a general conference assembled, in which the bishops presided, the members consisting of one delegate for every twenty-one preachers in an annual conference.

Such a complete system of supervision and control of the laity was never devised or exercised in any body from the earliest heresies to our times. The members are under constant supervision and control, constant excitement to fervor and perseverance, their daily life and family controlled, and yet the power of the Methodist body is in the hands of the conferences, from which all lay delegation and representation have till recently been excluded. The itinerant preachers, who ridicule all idea of apostolic succession and must admit that their power emanates from their flocks, maintained this authority and resisted all innovation, while they recognized that the system is without any sanction, and professing that church government is not of positive or binding force. The immense power thus wielded by this body, and the manner in which it is exercised, is seen in several cases.

The claim of the laity to a share in the government, and to a modification in this plan of secret control over them, soon led to discussion. At a very early period in England, Kilham advocated in a pamphlet *Progress of Liberty among the People called Methodists*, but was arraigned and expelled, on which he founded the "Methodist New Connection." The same agitation was revived in America soon after 1820, and the attempt was made to change the old system, "because its government secured to the itinerant ministers unlimited exercise of legislative, ecclesiastical, and judicial powers, to the exclusion of other ministers and all the people."

The stern hand of repression was however exerted, and the result was the establishment of the Methodist Protestant Church in 1830; but it never attained any large development, although it left in the Methodist Episcopal Church many who shared their views, and were resolved on pressing them in due season; but the rulers of the old organization regarded the new one with undisguised animosity. One of the historians, a sturdy adherent of the Methodist Episcopal Church, raises an objection to the new organization which to Catholic ears seems strange coming from a Protestant of any denomination. "Like other democratic churches," says Mr. Porter, speaking of the Methodist Protestant Church, "they lack energy in government—a *head*."

In time, however, the adherents of lay delegation moved again in the matter, and learning from experience in England and America, proceeded with more caution. Their cause was advocated with great skill and ability in *The Methodist*, an independent paper, remarkable for its attractive form and popular treatment of subjects. The question of lay delegation appeared at every General Conference, and in 1860 a committee actually reported in favor of it, although when submitted to a vote, nearly two members voted against it for one in favor of it, showing how strongly the lay members were influenced by the itinerant preachers. In 1872, however, the influence of the late war in weakening the power of the clergy in all Protestant denominations was seen in the Methodist Episcopal Church. The old barrier was broken down, the required majorities in favor of lay delegation were obtained almost without a struggle, and in 1872 the representation of the lay members in the General Conference went into effect. This departure from the practice of a century is so recent that its effect can scarcely be judged, but the change will doubtless lead to other modifications of the whole Methodist system.

The decline in the influence of the Protestant clergy in this country since the year 1860 has been very marked. Several causes seem to have combined to produce this result. The dignified old ministers of other days, schooled and grounded in their creeds and systems, had been succeeded by more worldly and superficial men, who could exert less real influence but were always straining for a short-lived popularity with the masses. In the Methodist body the earnest but often unlettered preachers of the old time, with their homely eloquence, had been replaced by men who aspired to a higher social position, who gave more time to literature, and who thus lost the hold which early Methodism possessed over the lower classes.

With the war came the temptation to the clergy to seek their own advancement; the active part taken by them individually and in bodies in the political affairs, the aspirations of many to office, and the bait of lucrative appointments destroyed the *morale* of their whole clerical body, and within the last twenty years the newspapers teem with charges against Protestant ministers, ecclesiastical trials, depositions, and expulsions.

The Methodist clergy were especially active in the North during the Civil War. Although the Wesleys and Whitefield began their labors in a southern colony and Methodism has always had its adherents in the Southern States, it was from the outset strongly opposed to slavery, and in this country has been from the first a powerful anti-slavery organization. None who held slaves were allowed any controlling influence unless they manumitted them.

An itinerant preacher whose wife inherited slaves was expelled for refusing to free them. A bishop was suspended till he complied. This led to fierce discussion; but as early as 1845 the Methodists in the slave States drew off, and formed at Louisville the Methodist Episcopal Church South, adopting nearly the same creed and system except in regard to slavery. The Supreme Court of the United States at last settled the rights of the two organizations to the common property.

This left the Methodist Episcopal Church North a strong and united anti-slavery body, and it became one of the powerful agencies in building up the Republican party. Other denominations had some Abolitionists, Free-soilers, men opposed to the extension of slavery, who became Republicans, but the Methodists went into the party in a body, and the whole influence of its widespreading organization was exerted in behalf of the Republican party when it stood as the opponent of the Democratic. The result was seen, not only in the action of Methodists who had belonged to the Democratic party, but in men who, without joining the Methodist Church were within its reach by reason that their wives or daughters were members. A Methodist church member or husband of a member is almost universally a Republican, and few of them fail to be active in its cause.

The Methodist press was thoroughly Republican, and a body that thus gave itself to one political party would scarcely be merely human if its opportunity did not beget political aspirations, and a desire to secure office and the control of government.

The press is in the hands of the Methodist Church, more than in that of any other denomination, a power. The Methodist Church holds the complete monopoly of publishing books and periodicals for the reading of the members. No private publishing or bookselling is tolerated. As early as 1773 Robert Williams, a preacher, reprinted some of Wesley's sermons and other books, but "the Conference disapproved of his course and required him to sell out and quit." As the historian adds: "This placed private publishing under embargo, and contributed no doubt to promote the connectional establishment, called 'The Methodist Book Concern.'" After the Revolution, the plan was organized in 1789, Rev. John Dickens was constituted "book steward" and commenced the publishing business in Philadelphia. Like Williams he put his own capital, six hundred dollars, in the business, but it was merely a loan; the business and its profits belonged to the Church, or as they prefer to say to the Conference. It will seem strange to Catholics that the first book issued by the Methodist Book Concern was The *Imitation of Christ*, by Thomas à Kempis.[1] The Book

[1] This fact escaped the late Rev. Mr. Finotti, who failed to note the edition in his Bibliographia Catholica. The volume must be very rare.

Concern, with the monopoly of supplying the reading to the whole denomination, throve and prospered. The modest capital of six hundred dollars on which it commenced in 1789 had become in 1873, $1,052,448 at the principal house in New York, with a branch at Cincinnati possessing a capital of $467,419. Besides this they paid the Methodist Episcopal Church South $190,000, and gave them the branch establishments at Richmond, Charleston, and Nashville. We can easily understand a Methodist writer declaring the Book Concern to be "an element of power which few appreciate, and which should be nursed and cultivated." Great excitement was caused a few years since by charges of fraud in the conduct of this immense business establishment, and in regard to it a change may before long be made.

The Concern publishes more than two thousand works, and prints love-feast tickets, Sunday-school tickets, Church membership certificates, and several periodicals: *The Christian Advocate*, *Sunday School Advocate*, *Missionary Advocate*, *Ladies' Monthly Repository*, *Christian Apologist*, and a *Quarterly*, the use of the word Methodist being, as will be noted, generally avoided. In 1850 the annual sales were $200,000, giving a profit of $42,161, besides $19,700 paid as Conference dividends for the support of the bishops.

But with this wealth and prosperity, with Gothic churches replacing the plain old meeting-houses, the denomination has lost some of its power over the less educated classes, by whose aid it was built up. The old-fashioned, homely, but eloquent appeals have almost disappeared; the camp-meetings, those great revival instrumentalities, have become modernized, and in many parts have led to a combination of seaside resort and camp-meeting, that is very strange, but which is perhaps more a speculation than otherwise. In these little summer towns Methodism can be seen and judged, and some idea formed what amount of liberty a community would enjoy completely under the control of its adherents. The Puritan idea of the Sabbath is enforced as stringently as it ever was in Connecticut; no liquor is allowed to be sold, no public diversions are allowed. A point that will strike a Catholic as strange is the small part the Scriptures have in their services. To one accustomed to a service, like the Mass or Vespers, made up of Scripture or redolent of it, the almost utter absence of biblical extracts in the religious services of those who are constantly talking about the Bible seems inexplicable.

When the division between men's minds in the North and South which rent the Methodist Episcopal Church into two bodies seemed to threaten the same result to the country, the Northern section of that Church, which was, as we have seen, thoroughly identified with the Republican party, adopted its cause with the greatest zeal

and energy. As one of their historians says: "The platforms of the two parties were squarely antagonistic, involving morality and religion. The Church, therefore, could not evade the contest. Ministers would be expected to take sides, as they had *not* previously done, where the issue was about finances." "But though many of our preachers and people entered the army, the work of God did not entirely cease."

The Methodist Episcopal Church in a body as a component part of the Republican party thus went into the war, so as actually to suspend in part its ecclesiastical life and character. It does not seem to have done this from any intense feeling of national allegiance or fidelity, but in the spirit that the administration for the time being was carrying out a favorite Methodist idea, and that the Church should use the government for that end.

General Grant, if not himself a member of the Methodist Church, was under its influence through his wife and family; and was thus a most acceptable candidate to that body. He was the first regular attendant on their services who had appeared as a candidate for the highest office in the republic. In the nominating convention and at the polls he had the full and earnest support of the Methodist Episcopal body, and on his accession to the Presidency he showed himself to be controlled by it as no President had ever been by the religious denomination to which he nominally belonged. In the distribution of public offices at home and abroad, Methodists and Methodist ministers were constantly provided for, and as though even the immense number of offices did not suffice, a new and strange one, that of visitor of American consulates, was devised to enable the pastor of the church which President Grant attended, the Rev. Mr. Newman, to make a tour of the world at the public expense. That the administration has gone down to history tainted by well-sustained charges of the grossest dishonesty and fraud, shows that the overpowering influence of the Methodist Church was not exerted for the best interests of the country.

In nothing, perhaps, was the dexterity and method of this denomination shown more clearly than in the manipulation of the Indian Department under General Grant. The war, by its crushing and terrible prostration of the South at the feet of the Republicans, had opened a vast field for missionary labor among the emancipated negroes of the conquered territory, and the Methodist Episcopal Church North began to push its organization throughout that portion of the country, where the Church South was still weak and all but powerless. One would have supposed this field enough for its zeal; but the Indian tribes, with the large amounts of money flowing through the corrupt Indian Department at Washington, was a temptation too strong to be resisted. A plan was

devised, of course solely with a view to the glory of God and extension of Christianity, to allot the agencies to the different religious denominations and their missionary societies; and the State actually gave these bodies the right to nominate government officials. The Indian agents were to be nominated by the denomination to which the agency was assigned; and this assignment was made without any regard to the missionaries who were actually laboring in a tribe or the Church which they had founded there, and to which the converts belonged. When the ukase went forth the Christian laborers who had been toiling and were beginning to be stimulated by hope of success were ordered to depart, and a new set of religious teachers imposed on the Indians by government came to manage things, temporal and spiritual, and their creed became for the time being the established Church within the limits of that agency. Thus a religious denomination obtained an agency, it named an agent of its creed, who was accordingly appointed by government, and a mission was established by the Church to which he belonged. The wife and daughters of the missionary frequently became the teachers in the agency school, and others of the family or creed had the monopoly of the trade.

The Methodist missions had not been the greatest in number or in extent of labor, still less in results, but of 74 agencies, 13, somewhat more than one-sixth, were assigned to them, and these agencies contained 65,746 Indians out of a total of 236,000, much more than a fourth of the whole aboriginal population.

The powers assumed by these sectarian agents showed the intolerance of their nature and training. In one Western agency a Methodist agent drove out the Catholic missionary and informed the Indians that he alone was authorized to baptize their children, and his letter to Washington complaining of the Catholic priest who questioned the divine right of a government Indian agent to baptize is set forth in the report of the Commissioner of Indian Affairs.

This was but a sample of the way in which this denomination availed itself of the opportunity afforded by the elevation of one of its flock to the chief magistracy of the nation. Episcopalians, Presbyterians, Unitarians, Protestants of various denominations had filled the Presidential chair, but in no case had any religious denomination attempted on that ground to obtain a lion's share of the offices or influence. This shameful initiative was left to this body. Whenever and wherever any national celebration or function admitted the services of a clergyman, a Methodist bishop or preacher appeared; of this the opening of the Centennial Exhibition may serve as an example.

When President Grant's second term was drawing to a close, he

was openly nominated for a third term in a Methodist conference, ostensibly assembled as a religious body, but which acted as a solid part of the Republican party, affecting no disguise, and apparently seeing nothing at variance with the principles of our government in this indecent action.

The election did not see General Grant as a candidate; but a Methodist, Rutherford B. Hayes, was the candidate of the Republican party. The contest was a close one, and by most unblushing frauds the result was such that on the papers presented neither candidate could be declared elected. A tribunal unknown to the Constitution was created, the Methodist candidate was declared elected, the parties to the frauds were rewarded with office, and the Methodist influence at the seat of government was continued for four years more.

The election of General Garfield broke this sectarian influence, and it was time. A new and unexpected danger to the welfare of the country has been developed in this action of one denomination, and safeguards, dictated by prudence and patriotism, must be devised to prevent any religion from making itself virtually the established Church of this country. The assassination of President Garfield by one who sought the restoration of the Grant influence has elevated to the difficult and responsible position of Chief Magistrate one who is an earnest and active adherent of General Grant and the principles which he represents, and who must look largely for support to the bishops, clergy, and laity of the Methodist Episcopal Church, who constitute so important and powerful a portion of the Republican party. To what extent President Arthur can free himself from their control is a question which time must solve; but everything seems to indicate that the Methodist influence over the national government and the foothold it has acquired will continue for the next term, and in all probability until a general indignation is aroused at the unwise course which this religious denomination has seen fit to adopt, and which must ultimately be as destructive to its influence in the sphere of religion as it will certainly be in the sphere of politics.

COUNT JOSEPH DE MAISTRE.

Mémoires politiques et Correspondance diplomatique de Joseph de Maistre, avec explications et commentaires historiques, par Albert Blanc. Paris, 1858–60.

Quatre chapitres inedits sur la Russie, par le comte J. de Maistre. Paris, 1859.

Œuvres complètes du Comte Joseph de Maistre. Paris, 1856.

HOW difficult it is for the Anglo-Saxon mind to understand the politics, the institutions, and even the literature of Continental Europe! How apparent are the insular habits of English thought touching religious and political life not in harmony with it! What contradictions, to the English-speaking people, are involved in the history of the Papacy, and how inextricable they seem through the distempering passions of three centuries of alien and unfriendly opinion! In the struggles of the Holy See with European Powers, more than in any other class of historical phenomena, "the eye," as Thomas Carlyle says, "sees only what it brings with it." Deep-seated as these prejudices are, and entering into deadly antagonism with every form and expression of Catholic life, they are not wholly ineradicable, for like all violent mental or moral perturbations, in due course of time they spend their strength and are succeeded by a calm, even though it be the calm of exhaustion, which is a more tractable condition than the prior abnormal excitement. No explorer of the intricate questions, which the conflicts of the Papacy have awakened, can ever forget his delight and satisfaction on first reading the treatise—*Du Pape*—of Count Joseph de Maistre, the keenest, wittiest, and most brilliant of that coterie of polemics who defended the Royalist cause at a period when the passions of men knew no limits, and when penury and exile were the price of adhesion to principle. More philosophic than Baron Von Eckstein of the *Catholique*, more learned than Vicomte de Bonald of the *Mercure*, and more zealous than Mallet-Dupan of the *Mercure Britannique*, Count de Maistre has left an influence upon the thought of his times far greater than that of any of his contemporaries. We remember how heartily we appreciated the misgivings which the detached sentence from the *Ecce Homo*—"Habit dulls the senses and puts the critical faculty to sleep"—created in the mind of the author of *The Invitation Heeded*, and the consequent investigation which that isolated quotation led to. A sentiment of kin to this from De Maistre, frequently quoted by Catholic writers, lived in our memory and suggested a similar train of thought in

historical study. The seeming paradox of De Maistre that "for three centuries history has been only one grand conspiracy against truth" was startling enough to turn the balance and disturb one's mental equipoise. Such, however, was our first acquaintance with the name of Count Joseph de Maistre, and we thought, here perhaps is a writer of another school who has embodied the results of his historical studies in an aphorism even more sententious than that which we had already learned from a deistical writer of the eighteenth century, who had said that "we are too apt to carry systems of philosophy beyond all our ideas, and systems of history beyond all our memorials."[1] Attracted to the writings of Count de Maistre by a desire to discover the grounds upon which he had developed this terse historical dictum floating about in the current Catholic literature as the *coup de maître* of a recognized leader, we now candidly confess that we can never sufficiently acknowledge our intellectual obligations to the great Savoyard publicist, and in order to discharge in part at least the debt of gratitude which we bear him, we propose to direct the attention of others who may be interested in the questions of religion, philosophy, and politics, to the light which his patient study and laborious research have thrown upon these and cognate subjects.

The character of De Maistre, formed by a happy interpenetration of lively wit and logical acuteness, combined with fine natural powers and colored by the circumstances of his age and position, is one of the most fascinating in the literature of Catholic Europe. As displayed in his writings, his character enhances one's desire to become familiar with his career, for of him it can be said, and the remark is true of few writers, that the life he lived was entirely in accordance with the principles which he enunciated in his works. There are points of resemblance which remind us of the late Dr. Brownson, although De Maistre is distinguished from him and from every other Catholic publicist by many marked individual traits, which give him as unique a position in Catholic Europe as that of Montalembert and Ozanam, of Cochin and the Prince de Broglie. Regarded nearly half a century ago by one of the finest non-Catholic scholars[2] of England as superior to the gifted but erratic De Lamennais, and still maintaining his place in the world of letters in spite of the many able champions which the Church has called since his day to the public arena in her cause, Count de Maistre is a grand specimen of the old Royalist of Europe whom no threat could intimidate and no prospect tempt. He enforced his Royalist and his religious principles with a dauntless courage

[1] Bolingbroke, Of the Study of History, letter iii., vol. ix., p. 58.

[2] We refer to Archdeacon Hare, one of the authors of Guesses at Truth. Crabb Robinson's Diary and Correspondence, vol. ii., p. 19.

and an intellectual power which won for him the respect and admiration, if not the sympathy, of the Republican opposition. These are a few of the reasons which induce us to recall his memory, and which we believe are sufficient to renew an interest in the works which his learning and his zeal have bequeathed to Catholicity.

Joseph Marie de Maistre, born at Chambéry, the capital of Savoy, on April 1st, 1754, sprung from an ancient and honorable patrician family of French origin, that had settled in the kingdom nearly a century before, when Savoy belonged to the Sardinian States. His father was a man of talents and of social and civic position, and gave to his children all the advantages commensurate with his own station and the regulations of a Christian home. He was President of the Senate of Savoy and Conservateur des Apanages des Princes. Among the earliest lessons taught in the domestic life of Catholic Europe, in which the ancient faith moulds and guides the conscience, is that of obedience. The discipline of the home, while, in some of its aspects, it may appear austere to American eyes accustomed to latitudinarian views of training, is of an hereditary and established character. Parental authority is recognized as delegated from God, and, if need be, it is asserted as dogmatically as any power divinely committed to men. As obedience is the foundation of all true happiness, the habits it engenders, stronger than law itself, become not only fixed, but the sources from which springs all real usefulness in the mental and moral world. This affectionate submission in youth, which is so noticeable in the early years of De Maistre, is the prelude to that self-control upon which so much depends in any career of life. The plastic boyhood of Joseph de Maistre was thus fashioned. The vigilant eye of a Christian mother guarded every avenue of his heart and his mind, and in speaking of her, he says: "Ma mère était un ange, à qui Dieu avait prêté un corps; mon bonheur était de deviner ce qu'elle désirait de moi, et j'étais dans ses mains autant que la plus jeune de mes sœurs." Even when he was a student at the ancient university of Turin, with its magnificent library, and free from the restraints of home, the same high sense of filial duty would not permit him to read a book without receiving the permission of his parents. We discover in this noble surrender to parental authority the kindred solicitude for maternal approbation which so delighted Châteaubriand in his first interview with Frederic Ozanam, when a student in Paris.[1] The mother of De Maistre was as remarkable for her qualities of mind as for her qualities of heart. She had mingled in the highest intellectual circles of her day, and had that acquaintance with public affairs which brought to her decisions a moral discrimination that would have been honorable to the acumen of a well-trained publicist.

[1] O'Meara's Life of Ozanam, p. 22.

Questions which affected the fortunes of the Church in the memorable conflicts of revolution and counter-revolution greatly interested as well as saddened her. When the news of the edict of the Parliament of Paris of 1763, expelling the Jesuits from France, reached Savoy, Joseph de Maistre was a child of nine years of age, playing with noisy delight about his mother's room. The outbursts of his innocent mirth ill accorded with the undertone of sadness which this renewal of persecution brought to her. Turning to her son, she said: "You must not be so gay, Joseph, for a great misfortune has happened." The strange words and solemn voice made an impression, which, while he understood it not, lived among the memories of his youth; for half a century afterwards he writes from the Court of St. Petersburg to an old friend: "There is nothing I value so highly as family feelings; my grandfather loved the Jesuits, my father loved them, my sublime mother loved them, my son loves them, and his son shall love them if the King gives him leave to have a son."

Having completed the course of study at the university, De Maistre now turned his thoughts to a public career, for which he was fitted by liberal education and hereditary tendency. He entered the magistracy not without misgiving as to the question of vocation, and soon occupied the position of senator in the councils of his country. Having married Mademoiselle de Morand at the age of thirty-two, we now see him pursuing his professional path, guided by principles of public duty well defined, and in the quiet enjoyment of those domestic pleasures which made his home the centre of his hope and his joy. Happy and contented in all his surroundings at Chambéry, full of ardor in the prosecution of his professional life and in the studies of the closet, De Maistre had just reached that period when a brilliant success gave promise of a serene and cloudless future.

But a restless spirit was at work in the heart of society,—a spirit nurtured by a false philosophy,—which was soon to make itself felt not only in Sardinia but throughout the entire Continent. It was destined to carry ruin into countless homes and scatter their inmates as chaff before the wind. Among the victims of its rage stood Count de Maistre, and the sufferings which he endured we shall presently see in the course of our narration. The amphibious country—as Piedmont is called by an Italian poet—had developed, out of various communities, chiefly through aggregation of territory, a distinctly national character, at the time when new federative families were springing into being, and before the boundaries of their respective domains had been clearly defined. Savoy, oscillating for a considerable period between Italian and French influences, was finally merged into Piedmont, and became thoroughly

Italian in government, manners, and habits of thought. It has been satirically said by her political enemies that it took the House of Savoy eight centuries to build up an insignificant kingdom, whose extent of territory was not beyond a four days' journey.[1] Conte nptuous as the remark may be, we may confidently challenge an historical parallel for healthy growth less interrupted, and for an independence less aided by fortuitous strength. The elements which combined to make Savoy both prosperous and happy, were the spirit and energy of its inhabitants, their devotion and their earnestness, their intelligence and their moderation. These qualities in the peasantry, when united to like traits in a long and illustrious line of rulers, whose interests were the interests of natives of the country, would naturally produce a type of character both vigorous and self-reliant, the surest guarantee of national success and progress. But the era for a general upheaval was at hand. The daring spirit which the writers of the eighteenth century had evoked in France had at length responded, and the Revolution broke out, spreading disorder and bewilderment in its march. The storm, which was destined to wreck the social fabric of Europe, was not slow in making its appearance in Savoy. The French invaded it in 1792, and the duchy became the République des Allobroges, and its inhabitants were compelled either to take the oath of fealty to the new government or to seek safety in exile. Property was confiscated, and homes were desolated. Among those which fell into the hands of the invaders were the ancestral possessions of Count Joseph de Maistre, whose person was an object of suspicion and of hatred to the commissaries of Sansculottism, now intrenched as the representatives of the new régime. In a delicate state of health Madame de Maistre had gone to Aosta, at the foot of the Great St. Bernard, not many miles distant from Turin. A brother of her husband was canon, and afterwards bishop, of Aosta, hallowed as the birthplace of St. Anselm, so dear to English Catholicity, and as the scene of the labors of that other great saint, whose name is as familiar in the mountain pass as in the hospice which bears it. It is of the canon, and a brother who had been a colonel in the Sardinian service, that Lamartine says in *Les Confidences:* "Tossed for a long time by the events of the Revolution, driven from one shore to another, they were like those rough stones of their own mountains, which have been rolled by the avalanche into the stream, which the torrent has worn and rubbed and polished for centuries, which have become bright to the eye and smooth to the touch, but which always remain stones, nevertheless, beneath the surface that has polished them."[2]

[1] "Quatre étapes de territoire." Cattaneo, Insurrection de Milan, Paris, 1848.

[2] Note xxviii., p. 237.

Hastening to Chambéry to share the fortunes of her husband in the new order of affairs, Madame de Maistre was in no condition to bear the fatigues of the journey or the excitement which awaited her on her return to the scenes of their early married life. The privacy of home was violated, and the curses and threats of a sanguinary soldiery brought terror to every heart save that of Count de Maistre, whose exalted courage derived its strength and support from the deep religious principle upon which it rested, as upon a rock. "Ce fut avec une profonde sagesse que les Romains appellèrent du même nom la force et la vertu. Il n'y a en effet point de vertu proprement dite, sans victoire sur nous-mêmes; et tout ce qui ne nous coûte rien, ne vaut rien."[1] The agents of the new government not only demanded of Count de Maistre the oath of allegiance, but also a contribution to its exchequer for meeting the expenses of war. He complied with neither exaction, and to the latter he answered: "I will not give money for slaying my brothers who serve the king of Sardinia." Madame de Maistre, when in her usual health, was not devoid of the spirit of bravery and of fortitude which animated her husband; but in her weakened state, beholding the Count in the hands of fifteen brutal emissaries of a foreign power maddened to frenzy by his unyielding convictions, she at length gave way to paroxysms of terror, and took to her bed through nervous exhaustion. The anguish of travail was thus hastened, and amidst the din and tumult of civil war, then devastating the ancient homesteads of Savoy, her youngest daughter, Constance, was born into the world. Perils and hardships thickened fast on every side, and Count de Maistre saw that resistance to the behests of a Revolution, which was destined to proscribe and impoverish some of the finest spirits of the age, was wholly unavailing, that it exposed not only himself but his family to insult and persecution of every description, and that life itself was endangered if he continued to dwell within the range of its fury. Leaving his youngest child, too frail to encounter the risks of a journey, under the care of her grandmother at Chambéry, he abandoned the home, endeared by associations of family and kindred, to find a refuge for his wife and children at Lausanne. Thither many *emigrés* from France and Italy had been driven by the progress of the revolutionary sentiment, and in thought, as in suffering, he was not without companionship in this asylum of expatriated nobles and scholars. Having received a ministerial commission from the King of Sardinia, Count de Maistre immediately acquired a position in Switzerland in which he could secure protection for his compatriots, and serve the counter-revolution by the

[1] Soirées de St. Petersbourg, i., p. 246.

use of his pen. Elsewhere in Europe the talents of kindred thinkers were at work. Presses as remote as London and Hamburg were sending forth innumerable pamphlets, which evaded the strictest surveillance, and made their way into France. An intellectual warfare, earnest and profound, was thus conducted in every centre of activity into which it could be carried. Writers of Calvinistic and Catholic antecedents, at irreconcilable variance with each other as to religion, were united in their efforts against the principles advocated by men whom Burke felicitously called the ablest architects of ruin that the world ever saw. About the same period that Count de Maistre was preparing for publication at Lausanne the *Considérations sur la France*, in which he discussed the fundamental doctrines of the philosophy of history, M. de Bonald was issuing from the press, which a few French *emigrés* had set up at Constance, his *Théorie du Pouvoir Politique et Religieux dans la Société Civile*, and M. Mallet-Dupan, at Hamburg, his *Correspondance Politique* and *Le Spectateur du Nord*. Châteaubriand, in exile and penury, foresaw the frightful excesses into which France was rushing with irresistible energy, and was writing, in a dreary and squalid garret in London, his *Essai Historique, Politique, et Moral sur les Révolutions*, in which he appealed, with the eloquence for which he was distinguished, to the precedents of both ancient and modern history, which he applied to the now existing order of affairs in his distracted country.

Count de Maistre's life at Lausanne, however great its trials and anxieties, had its peculiarly bright side. His temper was always full of courage and singularly independent of surrounding circumstances. His letters are entirely free from vain regrets and personal repinings; on the contrary, they show a Spartan endurance, which one hardly expects to find as part of the philosophy of so young a man. In one of these he says: "My property is all sold and I have nothing left;" and in another: "All my estates are confiscated, but I do not sleep the less for that." Like all exquisite natures, he was keenly sensitive to the influences of natural scenery, and the very altitude of the hills seemed to take him up at times far above the small interests and contentions of the common world. By a kind of inspiration, their summits led him to forget terrestrial things, and on their heights his ideal spirit detached itself from the narrow and sordid cares of the earth. The days of his sojourn in this place gathered moral and intellectual strength for the coming years. In charming walks, under the shadow of perpetual rocks and pines, his hours of solitude taught him how happy and serene a human soul might be in the midst of adversities as stern as the stony spires which towered above him. He had learned the true companionship of nature and his own soul. He apprehended the

Christian import of the paradox which Cicero has preserved as the saying of Publius Scipio: "Nunquam minus solum, quam cum solus esset."[1] Count de Maistre was one of those rare characters gifted with the moral and intellectual beauty which wins and retains affection, and with that indescribable personal charm which attracts to itself whatever kindness there is in the atmosphere, as plants absorb the moisture from the air. He was happy in the circle of choice friends gathered about him at Lausanne, whose love and appreciation followed him through life, and the memory of whom was a solace and a benediction in the years which he afterwards passed under the inhospitable skies of St. Petersburg. The death of Madame Huber, to whom he was warmly attached, called up the recollections of those happy days in Switzerland in which he enjoyed the culture and refinement of her home, and he has left this picture of his early friend: "You cannot fancy how present the poor woman is to my mind's eye. I see her constantly before me with her tall straight figure, her slight Genevese primness, her calm reason, natural *finesse*, and grave pleasantry. She was an ardent friend, though cold in all other respects. I shall never pass such evenings again as I have spent at her house,—my feet on the fender, my elbow on the table, thinking aloud, and skimming along on the wing over a thousand subjects, surrounded by her worthy family. She is gone, and I shall never replace her. When one has passed the middle of life—and I have long passed it probably—such losses are irreparable. Separated forever from all I love, I learn the death of my old friends; the young will one day learn mine. In truth, I died in 1798; the funeral only is put off. These lugubrious fancies form no contrast to public events, which are far from being *couleur de rose*. Some few thankless foreigners may be as you say sadly Russian, but as to me I am Russianly sad."

At the request of Charles Emmanuel IV., Count de Maistre and his family left Switzerland in 1797, and repaired to Turin. But he did not linger long here, for the French Revolution rushing like a torrent over Europe, the tricolor soon waved in triumph over the territories of the King of Sardinia. The King abandoned his Continental possessions and retired with his court to the island which had given the name to his kingdom. Among those who followed him thither to share his fortunes was Count de Maistre. But the chances and disappointments of war allowed him no rest for the sole of his foot. In the closing days of December, 1798, we again behold him going forth with a Prussian passport as a citizen of Neufchatel, and sailing down the Po with his family amid dangers and hardships which would have tempted a less intrepid and deter-

[1] De Officiis, iii., i.

mined man to yield to the superior power of the Revolution, and make the best of things. He, however, was a stranger to compromise, and understood not its terms. Before he reached Venice in safety he was wearied with the vexations and delays of the journey. A memorable and dangerous encounter with a detachment of French soldiers who boarded the vessel at a stage of the passage is worth relating. It is an evidence of the self-possession of our hero. Being on board, the soldiers demanded the passengers to show their passports, which they examined. Finding nothing upon which they could hold the travellers, they next engaged to entrap them by their language. When Count de Maistre's turn came, the French officer addressed him: "Citizen, you say that you are a subject of the King of Prussia, yet you have an accursed accent. I am sorry I did not send a ball through that carriage of aristocrats." "You would have done a fine feat," replied the Count; "you would have wounded or killed two young children, and I am sure that would have given you pain." "You are right," responded the officer, "I would have been more sorry for it than the mother." At length, however, this perilous journey drew towards its close, and Venice was to shelter him in peace for awhile. Few *emigrés* of the times have had more of that sustained and resolute heroism which steadily pursues an ill-rewarded course under most adverse conditions. In Venice so far as comfort was concerned he was more poorly off than ever. Absolute poverty now stared him in the face. The Austrian minister offered him lodgings in his private hotel, but Count de Maistre consented to occupy only one room on the ground floor with his wife and children. There are no sufferings which can come to a refined man, we fancy, more severe than such as the necessitous condition to which Count de Maistre is now reduced in a foreign city. But the greater the sensitiveness the greater the endurance of men true to the principles in which they believe. Here Count de Maistre lived, firm and conscientious, sustained by an abiding faith, and devoting to those Venetian days a zeal in study and writing which seems to us one of the finest examples of patriotic duty—"toujours ce mot austère et saint"[1]—afforded by the history of the French subjugation. And his example recalls to us the touching letter of Lord Perth from Stirling Castle, in which he was a prisoner of state for two years in the days of William of Orange, to Bossuet, through whose writings he became a Catholic. Sharing the fate of his royal master, James II., Lord Perth writes to the Eagle of Meaux: "I am suffering now both for my king and also for my God; and if there

[1] This was the beautiful expression of the Abbé Perreyve, in reply to a French soldier leaving for the Crimea, who had said to the saintly Perreyve, "Chacun son devoir, Monsieur l'Abbé."

is a noble greatness in suffering for the love of one's sovereign, how much more for one's religion and one's conscience?"[1] Count de Maistre stood not alone in his trials. Whatever of sorrow he endured, it was his wife's part to share, and whatever of good he accomplished, it was hers to encourage and sustain. The picture which this self-sacrificing hero presented in his vicissitudes, gathered around him friends to aid and to sympathize. To all their words of affection and confidence, he returned the same splendid utterance, full of Christian heroism: "All this is but the movement of the wave; the current may lift us up higher to-morrow, and then it will be difficult for us to steer our course."

With the close of the century Count de Maistre's sojourn at Venice terminated, and for a short time at least, he was again to enjoy an honorable station and the society of friends in the island of Sardinia. Being called home by his sovereign, Charles Emmanuel, who had now appointed him to the highest legal position in his kingdom,—régent de la Chancellerie royale,—he took up his residence in Cagliari. The duties of his new office were arduous and exacting, leaving him but little leisure for the cultivation of those literary studies in which he was so profoundly interested. For the dissatisfaction which he may have felt in surrendering all his time to the demands of public station, he had the compensation, however, of being in a home of his own, surrounded by his family and friends. Fortunate was it for Catholic literature that Count de Maistre was to spend but two years in this legal office, which almost entirely suspended his literary occupations. In 1802 he was commissioned by the Sardinian government, Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary to the Court of St. Petersburg, at which capital he was destined to spend fourteen years, the most important and laborious of his life, during which he produced those immortal works—"monumentum aere perennius"—which have made his name familiar to scholars everywhere, and endowed him with an imperishable fame.

Taking leave of his wife and children, he began his journey, which was more formidable then than now, when railways are common on the Continent. He could travel night and day regardless of comfort, whilst all places and hours were made subservient to his intellectual pursuits. Count de Maistre arrived at St. Petersburg on May 13th, 1803, and did not leave it till May 27th, 1817. His residence covered a period of unusual interest in the history of Russia. About two years before, Paul I. had been assassinated, under the shadows of night, by a band of Russian noblemen who had entered into a conspiracy to rid the empire of that half-demoniac tyrant. Never, even in the dark annals of Russia, had

[1] Life of Bossuet, p. 342.

a more execrable monster in human form sat upon a throne—never one with vices more colossal. He had employed all the machinery which his debauched mind could suggest, in wrenching from his subjects every vestige of right. He knew no law, human or divine, superior to the dictates of his own whimsical and disordered brain, and the edicts which he promulgated one day were often abrogated the next. He was devoid of every kingly attribute, and dead to the commonest instincts of man. His misgoverned empire had passed into the hands of his son Alexander, who, after the assassination, was proclaimed emperor. Coming to the throne through the intervention of conspirators, and conniving at the act by which he gained his power, it is not surprising that Alexander I. saw the necessity of vigorous and elaborate reforms on every side. In addition to the discontents rife everywhere and calling for pacification by a wise and enlightened public policy, his own mind turned naturally into liberal channels, for he had been trained by César de la Harpe from early youth in the principles of humanity and toleration. Count de Maistre made his entrée as a diplomate at the Court of Alexander when that emperor was inaugurating those reforms which, in part at least, redeem his name from the infamy of his subsequent retrogression. The society of St. Petersburg, more especially from the reign of Paul I., who came to the throne between the Reign of Terror and the Consulate, had always a considerable French element of the highest character. Its salons were graced by many *emigrés* of nobility who had found safety from the revolutionary storms which raged in Southern Europe. And while a residence there was not wanting in some of the agreeable features which a man like Count de Maistre could appreciate, still it bore but a poor comparison with the charming society of Switzerland. The splendors of court life in themselves were never attractive to him, and he found all his pleasures in those intellectual pursuits to which he now applied himself with his usual *entrain* and energy. After a residence of two years, he naively pictures his daily life to a lady friend: "My life is very like something you know,—the motion of a clock—*tic, tac*. Yesterday, to-day, to-morrow, and always. I can with difficulty drag myself out, and I often refuse dinners to indulge in the pleasure of staying a whole day at home. I read, I write, I learn, for after all one must know something. When nine o'clock comes I order myself to be dragged to some lady's house, for I always give the preference to women; I know, Madam, that you are not of the same opinion, but never mind, tastes differ. Somewhere or other then I try before the day is over to resume that native cheerfulness which has kept me up till now; I blow upon its flame as an old woman tries to light her lamp by the embers of yesterday's fire. I strive to forget the visions of broken

heads and arms which are constantly haunting me; then I sup like a young man, I sleep like a child, and wake like a man, that is to say, very early; and then I begin over again, always turning in the same circle, and invariably placing my foot in the same place, like a donkey in a mill."

Separated from his family and the friends to whom he was devotedly attached, Count de Maistre longed at times for that intellectual intercourse with kindred minds, of which nothing in the gay court life of the Russian capital could take the place. He valued the kindnesses which he received at court, and the generous hospitality so lavish in the higher circles of St. Petersburg. But as we have seen, such were not the supreme needs of an intellect and a soul fashioned like his. Work, hard and incessant work, was Count de Maistre's remedy for all the ills of life, but in spite of this, there came to him in moments of keen isolation, an intense desire for the scenes and associations of other years. It was the longing to roll back the mists which rise between the present and the past,—the thought so delicately expressed by Tennyson in one of the finest of his minor poems.[1] To Lausanne and the delightful friendships which enshrined it as almost a sacred place in his memory, Count de Maistre looked back with mournful pleasure. To an old Neufchatel friend, Madame Huber, he recalls in an exquisite letter those charming days,—a letter, which Sainte-Beuve says, a Ducis could not surpass.[2] It would be a pity to spoil such a gem by translation: "Jamais je ne me vois en grande parure, au milieu de toute la pompe asiatique, sans songer à mes bas gris de Lausanne et à cette lanterne avec laquelle j'allais vous voir à Cour. Délicieux salon de Cour! C'est cela qui me manque ici! Après que j'ai bien fatigué mes chevaux le long de ces belles rues, si je pouvais trouver l'amitié en pantoufle, et raisonner pantoufle avec elle, il ne me manquerait rien. Quand vous avez la bonté de dire avec le digne ami: *Quels souvenirs! quels regrets!* prêtez l'oreille, vous entendrez l'écho de la Newa qui répète: *Quels souvenirs! quels regrets!*"

The life of Count de Maistre at St. Petersburg was never ex-

[1] In the Valley of Cauteretz:

"All along the valley, stream that flashest white,
Deepening thy voice with the deepening of the night,
All along the valley, where thy waters flow,
I walked with one I loved two and thirty years ago.
All along the valley while I walked to-day,
The two and thirty years were a mist that rolls away;
For all along the valley, down the rocky bed,
Thy living voice to me was as the voice of the dead,
And all along the valley by rock and cave and tree,
The voice of the dead was a living voice to me."

[2] Causeries du Lundi, tome iv., p. 160.

empt from anxieties the most wearing. His salary was hardly sufficient to meet the ordinary expenses of living, but this was a small matter to him. Other and greater solicitudes weighed more heavily upon him. To represent a despoiled and impoverished king at the court of a nation which alone seemed to possess the power of frustrating the ambitions of Bonaparte, to awaken sympathy at that court for the fallen fortunes of his royal master, and to do all these things by the sheer force of genius unassisted by any of the occult resources which diplomacy commands, was indeed a task which might well have burdened the thoughts of one more skilled in the arts and intrigues of courts than Count Joseph de Maistre. He watched with eagle eye from his eyry in the North the progress of events in the South. He at times grew impatient for news, although he possessed his soul in perfect calmness, for he had an unshaken faith in the ultimate end towards which the meteoric career of Napoleon was tending. "I am relegated at one of the poles," says he, "and know nothing," and yet no man of the times knew Bonaparte better, or exercised a clearer prevision as to the results of his struggles for universal empire. His brother, Count Xavier de Maistre, best known to our generation by the little volume, *Voyage Autour de ma Chambre*,[1] a perfect and unique book of its kind, abounding in ingenious thoughts and philosophical reflections, left the military service of Sardinia at the time of the French occupation of that country, and subsequently emigrated to Russia. He was a man of versatile talents, and possessed in a high degree the literary and artistic expression. Painter, chemist, and man of letters, he soon won through the influence of his brother, the ambassador, the esteem of Alexander I., and preferment was not long in coming to him. He held positions both in the civil and military service of Russia, and finally settled down in St. Petersburg, to devote himself to the cultivation of literature and art, and here he produced those books which have been translated into all the civilized languages, and which have been the delight of so many readers. The two brothers were kindred in thought and in study, affording each other that mutual aid and encouragement which such a union of affections and pursuits would naturally develop. It was for Count Xavier de Maistre that his brother sketched with

[1] We think the reader will appreciate the exquisite touch of the literary artist, in the following passage from the *Voyage*. It happily describes the pleasures of the author's meditative brother, the ambassador: "C'est un excellent meuble qu'un fauteuil; il est surtout de la dernière utilité pour tout homme méditatif. Dans les longues soirées d'hiver, il est quelquefois doux et toujours prudent de s'y étendre mollement, loin du fracas des assemblées nombreuses. Un bon feu, des livres, des plumes; que de ressources contre l'ennui! et quel plaisir encore d'oublier ses livres et ses plumes pour tisonner son feu, en se livrant à quelque douce méditation, ou en arrangeant quelques rimes pour égayer ses amis! Les heures glissent alors sur vous, et tombent en silence dans éternité, sans vous faire sentir leur tristê passage." Chap. iv., p. 5.

his pen in an animated vein, half serious, half comic, some scenes from his early domestic life as an ambassador of the Russian court: "This is the second winter," says he, "I have passed without a fur pelisse,—which is very much the same thing as to have no shirt at Cagliari; when I leave the court, or the imperial chancellor's, a very shabby lackey throws a shopman's cloak over my shoulders. As the attendance of a single servant is considered impossible here on account of the climate and the work, in order to have a second I have taken a thief, who was on the point of falling into the hands of justice, and I have proposed to him to become an honest man, under the shadow of my diplomatic protection. For the last few months I have managed to get on pretty well; the *traiteur* who used to feed, or rather poison me, having removed, I cannot get him, so I have made up my mind to share my servant's mess. The want of servants in this country, and in my situation, is one of the most singular torments that can be imagined, and one of which you can form no idea where you are. However, I do not find that I am looked down upon, but quite the reverse. What amuses me exceedingly is to see people come and ask for my support, which they do frequently."

The outward circumstances in the career of Count de Maistre were so shaping themselves that the interests recalling him to Sardinia were lessening. His son Rudolph, having reached the age of sixteen years, was now exposed to conscription if he remained at Turin. It was impossible for him to be false to the country and false to the king whom his father had served with unswerving devotion, through the disappointments of many checkered years. This thought was sufficient to supply the motive to flight, if the young man needed any other than that of his recognition of right principles. Nothing remained to Rudolph, but to join his father, at St. Petersburg, from whom he had been separated for about four years. This is the plan determined upon, and when next we see him he is an officer in a regiment of the Russian Guard, enduring the hardships of the campaigns in a spirit not unworthy of his lineage. Count de Maistre's letters at this period are especially pathetic. His anxieties have increased now that his son is exposed to the dangers of war. "None know what war is," he says, "save those who have sons engaged in it." The shadows of his life seem to deepen. Burden after burden bears upon him by day and by night, and his natural cheerfulness almost forsakes him. He pictures the gloomy forebodings which haunt him: "Enterminant mes journées monotones, je me jette sur un lit, où le sommeil, que j'invoque, n'est pas toujours complaisant. Je me tourne, je m'agite, en disant comme Ezéchias: *De mane usque ad vesperam finies me.* Alors des idées poignantes de famille me transpercent. *Je crois entendre pleurer à*

Turin; je fais mille efforts pour me représenter la figure de cette enfant de douze ans, que je ne connais pas. Je vois cette fille orpheline d'un père vivant. Je me demande si je dois un jour la connaitre. Mille noirs fantômes s'agitent dans mes rideaux d'indienne."

Animated by patriotic feelings in behalf of his countrymen and zeal for his sovereign, Count de Maistre conceived the idea of going to Paris, to seek a personal interview with Bonaparte. He entertained the opinion that if he were allowed to confer with the usurper face to face, he might obtain some redress for the loss of the Continental possessions of his king. He was too well acquainted with public affairs and the character of Napoleon to expect Piedmont to be restored to Charles Emmanuel, but he anticipated that good results would attend his negotiations, if he could secure an audience consonant with the magnitude of his mission, and which his high character and reputation would seem to warrant. The proposal irritated his sovereign, who regarded it as inconsistent with the duty of an ambassador and with the dignity of the throne. Whether the plan proposed was a wise one or not, we do not pretend to determine, but we do argue that it proceeded from the purest motives on the part of Count de Maistre, and was entitled to a delicate consideration from his sovereign. When we remember the surrender which he made for his king,—fortune, home, family, and all the associations which men hold dear,—we are not surprised at the fine irony contained in his reply, or at the chagrin which such a faithful servant should feel in being so thoroughly misunderstood. Count de Maistre showed that his intended visit to Paris was to have been made in his private and not in his diplomatic character, and that he apprehended no dangers in meeting Napoleon. He then adds with admirable effect a dignified regret, which Charles Emmanuel could not fail to appreciate. "I had not much fear of Bonaparte," says he; "the first quality of a man born to subdue and lead others is to know men. Without this quality he would not be what he is. I should be glad to think that his majesty deciphered me as well."

A great crisis, often predicted, had at length arrived, and the downfall of Bonaparte was at hand. The day of deliverance from his usurpations identified with misgovernments, both tyrannical and flagitious, had dawned, and Count de Maistre saw with mixed hope and fear the end of a despotism which had pulled down the old French institutions. But what was to take their place? He hailed the deposition of Napoleon with joy, while he watched the European coalitions growing out of it with alarm. He had never underestimated the superior abilities of Bonaparte, who was likely at any moment to command resources equal to any emergency. On the

contrary, he had always maintained that it was worse than folly to ridicule a power that had destroyed institutions consecrated by the veneration of ages, and made them a mockery in the eyes of the multitude. He met such expressions engendered by hate on the part of his compatriots with a satire as delicate as it was incisive: "Quand j'entends parles ici dans les salons de ses fautes et de la supériorité de nos généraux, je me sens le gosier serré par je ne sais quel rire convulsif aimable comme la cravate d'un pendu." Although the events which culminated in the destruction of the man who bestrode the world like a Colossus,[1] they failed to produce results entirely satisfactory to Count de Maistre. The annexation of Savoy to France by the provisions of the treaty of Paris was a bitter disappointment. He soon saw that the restoration of the House of Bourbon, perhaps gratifying enough in itself, was not destined in the course of affairs to call into power men in whom he reposed much confidence.[2] They belonged rather to that class of minds to whom the remark of an acute critic may be applied,—"n'ont rien oublié, ni rien appris." He opposed the arbitrary divisions of kingdoms in order to create and protect a balance of power. He believed that this principle, recognized as a cardinal feature in the adjustment of treaties, was a violation of the eternal fitness of things. The treaty of Paris, therefore, was not a permanent solution of European difficulties. It was but an armistice between opposing forces. Out of such statecraft would spring kindred disorders which he deplored. But however gloomy his views of public affairs then appeared, he was not a pessimist. The same belief in the Divine Beneficence which had sustained him in exile sustained him now, and the sublime confidence which he uttered in one of his earliest publications animated him in the midst of every new complication, the outcome of which he could not clearly foresee: "There is no chastisement which does not purify; there is no disorder which the principle of eternal love does not turn against the spirit of evil. Amid the general disorganization, it is delightful to foresee the plans of the Almighty. We shall never be able to understand everything during the course of our pilgrimage; often we shall fall into mistakes; but are we not reduced to surmises in every possible branch of knowledge, with the exception of the exact sciences? And if our surmises are plausible; if they are in accordance with the laws of analogy; if they are supported

[1] Shakespeare, Julius Cæsar, act i., sc. ii.

[2] In the year 1802, during the Consulate, Count de Maistre wrote: "The Bourbons of France are inferior to no reigning family: they have a fair share of wit and goodness, they possess that self-respect which springs from ancient greatness, and lastly the useful knowledge that misfortune teaches; but although I think them very worthy of enjoying royalty, I consider them quite incapable of restoring it. The hand of a usurper and a man of genius is alone firm and rough enough to accomplish that work."

by universal ideas; if above all, they are soothing and calculated to render us better, what is there wanting to them? Even if they should not be true, they are good; or rather, if they are good, is not this a proof that they are true?"[1]

There is no character from which we are more inclined to recoil than from the man of pure intellect, no matter how powerful and imposing that intellect may be. We shrink from the rational mind unwarmed by the emotional in man, and leave it to dwell in its desolate and solitary grandeur as an abnormal creation. We have seen, however, enough of Count Joseph de Maistre, in spite of the charges which unfriendly critics make, to discover that he was not deficient in natural affections, and that his nature was neither cold nor languid.[2] Whatever of good or whatever of evil the fall of Napoleon may have accomplished for the progress of national life, it brought one supreme joy, wholly unalloyed with pain, to Count de Maistre. He had now the happiness of meeting his wife and children from whom he had been so long separated. The infant Constance, whom we left twenty years before at Chambéry in the care of her grandmother, had now grown to beautiful womanhood. The picture of so much loveliness developed during the weary years of his exile, and the recollections of the trials and privations which it awakened, quite overpowered him, for he had now turned his sixtieth year, and the world to him was not as bright and illusive as

> "When life was young and truant hope was new."

We will not dwell upon the scenes of that reunion, so gentle, so tender, nor would we disturb its serene and lofty peace. It is better to leave to the imagination of the reader

> "The thousand still, sweet joys of such
> As hand in hand face earthly life."

During the years which Count de Maistre had passed at the Russian capital he had formed many associations, which he was reluctant to break up. He was respected and honored by Alexander I., over whom he had exerted no small influence for good; but that unfortunate monarch had now reached a stage in his strange career when the potent spirit of evil seemed to have seized him. Count de Maistre had determined to continue his residence at St. Petersburg, but untoward events in the public policy of

[1] Considérations, etc., chap. iii.

[2] Who that reads this passage, full of tenderness, taken from a letter written from St. Petersburg to one of his brothers, would pronounce Count de Maistre either cold or languid in his affections? "A six cents lieues de distance, les idées de famille, les souvenirs de l'enfance me ravissent de tristesse. Je vois ma mère qui se promène dans ma chambre avec sa figure sainte, et, en t'écrivant ceci, je pleure comme un enfant."

Russia were likely to transpire which his loyal nature could never countenance even by his presence at court. The career of Alexander I. is one of the most melancholy in history. It reads like an ugly chapter drawn from the lives of the Cæsars. In the early part of his reign he had excited high hopes by his broad views and tolerant mind. But the blood of a vile and ignoble ancestry flowed in his veins. His father, Paul I., who, as we have seen, fell by the hands of assassins, was an infuriate madman, and his grandmother, Catharine II., called the Semiramis of the North, the friend of Voltaire and D'Alembert, was one of the most profligate of her sex,—a Lady Macbeth in the enormity of her wickedness. It was under her tutelage that Alexander was brought up. His environment, save in one particular, was altogether evil. He was a silent party to his father's assassination, if not an actor in the fatal scene. With all these wild memories haunting his steps, and with madness and murder tainting his blood, is it strange that Alexander could not dispel the shadows which hung over him, or escape the deadly influences with which the consummate duplicity and cunning of courtiers had surrounded him?

From the times of Catharine II.,[1] the Jesuits had been kindly treated in Russia, and at her request they had established colleges at Dunabourg, Orcha, Vitepsk, and at Polotsk. Paul I. had encouraged their labors, and called them to St. Petersburg. When Alexander I. ascended the throne, he continued to show the same generous appreciation of the order which had marked the reigns of his predecessors. The schools of the Jesuits had now grown into important institutions in the literary progress of Russia. Following the principles of the *ratio studiorum*, and guided by admirable discernment, they had at first adapted their course of study to the rudimentary needs of the empire, and as these were met the curriculum was expanded, so that at the period of which we speak their colleges had attained a reputation quite commensurate with that which the Jesuits had won in older European fields. Since the conversion of Princess Alexis Galitzin early in the century, the number of converts to the Catholic Church among distinguished Russian families had greatly increased, and the example of that brilliant and gifted woman, Madame Swetchine, whom Count de Maistre had assisted in her progress toward Catholicity, exerted a powerful influence in the higher circles of society. Quietly as the Jesuits were pursuing their work in different parts of the empire, the conversions among the aristocracy could not fail to arrest attention, and an opposition to the Order, founded neither on justice nor equity, gradually assumed an imminent activity. No

[1] Like Frederick II. of Prussia, Catharine II. forbade the publication of the brief Dominus ac Redemptor of Clement XIV., suppressing the Jesuits.

tenable grounds of complaint had been lodged against the Jesuits with the government; they had violated no laws; they had interfered with no public policy. But what of that? The autocrat recognizes no law superior to his will,—"Hoc volo, sic jubeo, sic pro ratione voluntas."[1] When the power behind the throne seeks to poison the mind of royalty, prejudice often does its work more effectively than reason. But the other day we witnessed the parallel in France in a like persecution of the Order. The illustrious publicist, Judge Black, one of the few really great minds now left to us in the public arena, as fearless as he is always magnanimous, has so well described the present crusade against the Jesuits by a government calling itself a republic, that we quote his words as entirely applicable to the then state of affairs in Russia under Alexander I. "Without conviction, without trial, without an accusation of any specific offence or defined misdemeanor," says he, "a religious society is deprived of its property and denied the right to instruct its disciples or propagate its faith, or impart even secular knowledge to the pupils who gather in its schools. Is this liberty, equality, and fraternity? Is it the common justice which every government owes to its subjects? For my part, I never could understand how it was honester to rob a church than to rob anybody else, nor do I see why a man or a body of men are supposed to put themselves beyond the pale of legal protection by adopting a creed which their political rulers suppose to be erroneous. I have listened with proper docility to the arguments of French infidelity, but they are not convincing. The disbelief of this government in the cosmogony of Moses and its contempt for the morality of Christ is not a satisfactory reason for plundering people who perversely but conscientiously adhere to the faith of their fathers."[2]

Count de Maistre had watched the current of thought against the Jesuits and the insidious attacks on their good name. He apprehended the gravity of the situation, and especially the extreme difficulty of meeting impalpable insinuations, delicately and persistently fostered by astute minds, Machiavelian in their subtlety. With all the logical acumen which a trained intellect could employ, he pleaded the cause of the Order with the emperor. The eloquence of such a frank and earnest soul, stirred against such muniments of injustice reared by craft and fraud, made Alexander, for a time at least, irresolute. But what chance was there for conviction

[1] Juvenal, Sat. vi., 223.

[2] The Weekly Republic of Washington, August 15th, 1880, p. 412. Judge Black again refers to the "present persecution of the Jesuits by the infidel republic of France" in his caustic reply to Mr. R. G. Ingersoll in the North American Review, August, 1881.

to secure any permanency in the mind, when, before the arguments had time to reshape themselves, stratagems of every kind were called into play to defeat them? These zigzag movements, however, did not long continue. The indecision which had stayed the cruel edict against the Jesuits was at last overcome, and in the opening days of 1816 an imperial ukase was promulgated, banishing them from St. Petersburg and Moscow. Four years later they were expelled from all Russia and Poland, thus completing another act in the dark drama which kingdoms and principalities united in playing for their extermination. Count de Maistre acted as it might naturally be expected that he would act. His mission at the court of Alexander was now ended. "In a country like Russia," said he, "there should be no cloud between the sovereign and a foreign minister." Without hesitation he wrote to his king requesting to be recalled, and it was on the 27th of May, 1817, that he took final leave of St. Petersburg. A squadron was about to be sent to the French coast to convey the Russian troops home. In token of the esteem in which Count de Maistre was still held by the emperor, he was granted the privilege of embarking on one of these ships, the Hamburgh. He landed at Calais, and, after a few weeks stay in Paris, he reached Turin toward the close of August.

No man ever returned to his native land after a long career in diplomacy which was more honorable and consistent in every particular, and no country ever presented an indefatigable servant with a warmer and sincerer welcome. A European fame, ripened slowly but surely during an almost continuous absence of five and twenty years, brought new honors and troops of friends to crown the evening of his days. Appointed to one of the highest offices of the kingdom,—Régent de la Grande Chancellerie,—he employed those closing years in discharging the duties of his public trust, and preparing for publication writings which had beguiled the weary days and sleepless nights during the usurpations of Napoleon. Meantime, the health of the Savoyard publicist was gradually undermined. The death of his brother Andrew, Bishop of Aosta, a prelate distinguished both for learning and piety, was a great affliction, and came under circumstances when the shock was peculiarly saddening. A family reunion had been arranged for the 19th of July, 1818, at the residence of Count de Maistre. Revolutions, as we have seen, had broken up homes, the inmates of which were now again to meet face to face after a long separation. Many had arrived in happy anticipation of the event, which was speedily converted into a scene of distress. On the morning of the day before the gathering, after an illness of a few hours, the Bishop of Aosta died in the arms of his brother, Count Joseph. "We are

desolate, thunderstruck," writes he, a few days later to Madame Swetchine, "more dead than he!" Sorrows upon sorrows clouded the waning years of his life. An undercurrent of indescribable sadness is quite visible, and is bearing him along through the inevitable changes with which all earthly life is fraught. He feels that the hand of death is gently but surely touching him. He writes to M. de Marcellus: "D'autres épines s'enfoncent dans mon cœur; mon esprit s'en ressent; de petit il est devenu nul; *hic jacet;* mais je meurs avec l'Europe; je suis en bonne compagnie!" A slow paralysis is by degrees sapping his strength; but his country again needs his clear judgment. Rumors of the revolutionary agitation of the year 1821 in Piedmont lead to the assembly of a council of ministers, in which certain legislative questions are to be discussed. Count de Maistre attends, and makes the last speech of his life in opposition to the changes proposed, as the time is inopportune. His final public utterance, in behalf of the country he had served so loyally, closes with these words: "Gentlemen, the ground is trembling under our feet, and you would fain build." At length the end came, and on the 26th of February, 1821, after a life of sixty-seven years, very memorable in European history, Count Joseph de Maistre died as he had lived, the exemplar of all that is pure, of all that is heroic, and of all that is worthy of this earthly existence.

Thirty years have now elapsed since M. Jules Barbey d'Aurevilly, a young French author, adopting the piquant expression, we believe, from a political novel of M. Ballanche, published a series of literary portraits, entitled *Les Prophètes du Passé.* The significant title embodied a paradox which pleased the Radical critics, with whom it became the sobriquet of that class of conservative writers who were wedded to the past, who reverenced ancient institutions, who admired the stability of olden times, were averse to sudden changes, and suspicious of novelties in civil or ecclesiastical polity. In the light of this interpretation of the title, Count Joseph de Maistre certainly occupies a chief place among the prophets of the past, although he was the advocate of much in the secular order of nations with which we have little sympathy, and to which, indeed, we attach but little importance. But the critics pressed the phrase into wider service, and included in their condemnation any writer who opposed the revolutionary tendencies of the times. If we can utter any prediction with regard to the logic of events, humanly speaking, that prediction can be founded on no surer evidence than that furnished by experience, which is the cumulative argument based upon antecedent probabilities. If a theory of induction can be derived from the principles of human nature which govern men invested with civic powers, it demands a point of view

both profound and comprehensive, an intuitive gift both analytical and imaginative, that is able to summon with panoramic skill those historical precedents which assume almost the force of law in the conduct of affairs. No such system of induction, however full, can be unerring in its results, for it can establish at best only that kind or degree of probability, at which we arrive, when we reason from the course which a man follows in one situation to the course he will follow in another. In truth, the motive power in human nature expresses itself in a universal language; and the external aids which history supplies co-ordinately with the internal means of common-sense and natural perception,—these and these alone are the safest guides for its interpretation. Count de Maistre, even when far removed from the scene of action, was fond of indulging in prophecy as to the turn of public affairs, and, like all minds intent upon guessing at results on insufficient data, he made some lamentable failures. The political prophet in our age, with the multifarious means at command which we have indicated, plays no higher part than that of the guesser, and the best guesser after all, as Euripides has said, is the best prophet.[1] Count de Maistre lived to witness respectively the failure and the fulfilment of his political predictions, and in none are his mistakes more signally apparent than in those which relate to the foundation of our seat of government at Washington, in the beginning of the century. He predicted that the city would not be built, that if built it would not be named in honor of the first President, and that it would not be the capital of the republic. It is amazing that a man of such rare sagacity, of such unrivalled skill of combination, and of such perfect mastery of the weapons of logic, should establish a declaration so positive on the slenderest hypothesis. Count de Maistre simply assumed that, as these three designs were integral parts of the plan which the founders of Washington had in view, one or two, or all of them, must fail of accomplishment, because no preconceived arrangement as to government was ever likely to be carried out in its original entirety. It would be interesting to trace how far the monarchial opinions of such a lucid mind modified such ludicrous speculations about a republican capital, but we cannot enter upon an abstract question so remotely connected with an illusion which Count de Maistre himself saw dispelled not many years after the announcement of his prophecy. As we have exhibited a notable instance of his failure in discerning future events, let us see how far he was successful when he confined his passion for subtle foreshadowing to a condition of public affairs with which he was more intimately acquainted. The following verses represent very tersely the popular sentiments when Napoleon was elevated to the Consu-

[1] Μάντις ἄριστος ὅστις εἰκάζει καλῶς. Dindorfius—Fœtæ Scenici Græci, p. 124.

late, and they contain, as far as the French people are concerned, as clear an expression of the popular will as could be reached by any one who studied the temper of the times:

> "Ceux qui veulent de lui ne veulent pas de roi,
> Ceux qui veulent un roi ne veulent pas de lui!"

Among the contemporaries of the Savoyard publicist, the name of no writer occurs to us who foresaw as clearly as he the dazzling but short-lived career of Napoleon and its almost tragic end. Certainly no adherent of Count de Maistre's political principles understood, as did he, either the drift of the usurper's plans or the motives which animated him at every stage of his eventful destiny. His prophetic ken discerned every move of Napoleon's will with as much precision as the practiced eye of the chess-player detects the aim of his antagonist, and while his compatriots indulged in a fierce hate which blinded them to signs visible and intelligible to calmer minds, he was exempt from that prevailing political strabismus which affected the vision of so many of the stanchest opponents of Bonaparte. In the person of the future prisoner of St. Helena he recognized the genius of destruction: "Un grand et terrible instrument entre les mains de la Providence."[1] The public men of the times which followed the overthrow of Napoleon were by no means deficient in that kind of ability which successfully grapples with momentous questions, and while their talents for statesmanship were developed to a remarkable degree, they did not equal the Savoyard publicist in clearness of foresight as to the probable issues which were hidden from view. In the last year of his life he felt the premonitory movings of revolution, and his speech at the council of ministers presaged the impending storm which broke over Piedmont in the month succeeding his death.

Men, unable to understand the elevation of Count de Maistre's mind, have tried to ally the vehemence and pertinacity of his predictions with a vulgar superstition, the offspring of ignorance and imbecility. But they have altogether failed. A mind so fertile as his, and so little restrained by the desire for concealments in conduct or in language, underestimated the danger to which his honesty of thought and honesty of expression exposed him. A school of political writers and diplomatic tricksters, moulded by the base principle of Talleyrand,—"La parole a été donnée à l'homme pour déguiser sa pensée,"—which outvies Machiavelli himself, could not

[1] De Maistre said in 1807: "A usurper who is arrested to-day that he may be hanged to-morrow, is not to be compared to an extraordinary man who holds possession of three-fourths of Europe, who has compelled recognition from all monarchs, who has allied himself with three or four royal houses, and who has taken more capitals in fifteen years than the greatest captains have taken cities in their lives. Such a man springs from the people. He is a great and terrible instrument in the hands of Providence."

be expected to comprehend a freedom of utterance in a publicist who had nothing to fear and nothing to hide. "En général," says Count de Maistre, "les grands écrivains craignent le néologisme; un sentiment secret les avertit qu'il n'est pas permis d'entreligner l'écriture de nos supérieurs." In De Maistre's day Talleyrand was beyond doubt one of the master-spirits of diplomacy. What a contrast their lives present! Our age has rendered its verdict as to both, which we believe posterity will pronounce final. No man better understood the power of language than Talleyrand, who possessed an epigrammatic force and felicity of expression peculiar to himself. His gift of speech, like his practical wit, conspired to selfish purposes, and enabled him to serve three rival sovereignties in the highest positions of state. "All degradation, whether individual or national," says De Maistre, "is straightway announced by a degradation exactly proportional in the language. How could man lose an idea, or even the integrity and uprightness of an idea, without losing the word, or the accuracy of the word, that expresses it; and how, on the contrary, can he have either new or better thoughts without its becoming manifest immediately in his speech?"[1]

It is a wild moral paradox, too common at all times, which countenances one ethical code for the private citizen and another for the public functionary. It is worse than idle to attempt to reconcile the principles of double-dealing and deceit in the conduct of diplomacy with those of frankness and integrity in the conduct of life. If the former are the guides of action in the one case, they will be in the other, and *vice-versa*. He who is treacherous and mendacious in the administration of affairs of state, is not to be trusted in the business relations of private pursuits. The laws of honor and honesty are inexorable, and by them we determine the worth of character in every station of life. Talleyrand cajoled royalty, negotiated important treaties, counselled judicial murder, changed his principles to suit the times, and took the oath of allegiance we know not how often. He paid the price and he gained the reward. He reached an old age soothed by no happy memories, but darkened by a settled melancholy which his execrable career had prepared for him. The diplomatic ethics which Count de Maistre followed harmonized perfectly with his recognition of the essential difference between right and wrong,—a difference as fixed and eternal as the Author himself who created it. While he may have achieved no startling successes as a diplomate, yet he obtained that kind of confidence and sympathy which consistency always exacts, even at the hands of political enemies. His opinions were courted by different nations, and on questions as divergent as

[1] Soirées de St. Petersbourg.

those of public education and financial policy. Louis XVIII., in 1804, addressed him a letter of thanks for his work on the French Revolution; Napoleon ordered his name to be erased from the list of French emigrants, permitted him to return to France, and to retain such titles of distinction as he had received in the service of the King of Sardinia. Even in autocratic Russia there still exists, we are informed, a manuscript, which he prepared at the request of Alexander, relative to the administration of affairs in that empire. The highest praise which M. Lally-Tolendal could award to the memory of Mallet-Dupan, the liberal Protestant of Geneva and the personal friend of Count de Maistre, applies with singular aptness to the latter. These were his words in the *Courier de Londres:* "Personne n'est moins trompé que lui: personne surtout n'a moins que lui voulu tromper les autres."

WESTMINSTER ABBEY.

"WHAT is an abbey?" might be a difficult question to answer — in the exceptional instance of Westminster. Most English dictionaries associate the word abbey with monastic or conventual institutions; but no guide-book of Westminster Abbey would go so far as to assert that the Abbey *is* monastic or conventual. A small guide-book, called *A Historical Description of Westminster Abbey, its Monuments and Curiosities*, printed for the vergers in the Abbey, suggests the idea of a book which is designed to contrast two distinct dispensations. The old Abbey was intensely Roman Catholic, in every symbol, inscription, and effigy; the new Abbey, of Protestant renovation, is only Christian so far as "it cannot help itself." Whatever is Christian is of the past. We must admit that the choir services are orderly and pretty, and the music devotional and soothing; but if we come to examine into the backbone of the whole thing, we find that there is no backbone to be examined into. The sentiment of Christian devotion remains with the débris of once-Catholic doctrine; but, as an effect without a cause, the sentiment and the débris have no sympathy with the grand Catholic pile. Why there should be a chapel of St. Benedict, of St. Edmund, of St. Nicholas, of Abbot Islip; or why there should be a chapel of the Blessed Virgin; or

why there should be a screen to veil mysteries of which the present religion knows nothing; or why there should be "miserere stalls" for monks and canons, when the canons are most certainly not monks, and have no intention that their sons should become so, are questions which our guide-book does not answer, and which it might be indiscreet to insist upon. "Laudator temporis acti" would not be a fitting motto to be placed over the stalls of the present canons. Still less could it be placed over their homes. The very picturesque and comfortable residences, in which most of the Abbey clergy dwell at ease, are not suggestive of the monastic idea, save only in certain outlines ineffaceable. Lady Augusta This, and the Honorable and Reverend Mrs. That, do not sympathize with the conventual idea. They are excellent friends to the poor, and admirable types of modern virtue, but they are not precisely of the spirit of this Abbey. How they were introduced into the Abbey we all know. It was by the conversion of the Abbey into a conventicle. To turn to our guide-book—which is at least honest, if not critical—we are told that "by the robberies made by Henry VIII. upon the Abbey, and the ravages it sustained during the unhappy civil (?) commotions, its ancient structural beauty was in great measure destroyed." But a good many other things were destroyed in the Abbey besides its ancient structural beauty. The institution of "the Religious" was destroyed. In the place of the monastic came the wedded clergy; and we can hardly expect that the ladies of the nineteenth century should find fault with such domestic innovation.

To walk through the Abbey is to continually ask oneself the question: What is the relation between the Church and its furniture? Anything more exquisitely beautiful, more profoundly instructive and even inspiring, than the outline and mind of the fabric we do not often meet with in any church; but the paltry monuments—to this Protestant or to that Dissenter, to this Calvinist or to that Scotch Presbyterian—do not harmonize with the idea of the Abbey any more than with the idea of the Roman Catacombs. They are simply out of place. They are a satire on themselves, not on the Abbey. They are also in painful contrast to the Catholic shrines. When we visit the shrine of St. Edward the Confessor, or even the burial-place of the saintly Queen Matilda, we recognize the fitness of the veneration, and do not grudge the narrow place in the House of God. Even the chapel of Henry VII., designed for royal use,—the burial-place of Mary Stuart, Queen of Scots, of Queen Mary of England, and of other well-reputed Catholic personages,—is consistent with the idea of a Catholic abbey—of an abbey which is, in many senses, national. But illustrious personages are mingled in their death who, when

living, had different religions. Queen Elizabeth lies here. On her monument is the assurance that she was "the mother of her country . . . . in her reign religion was restored to its primitive purity . . . . she was for forty-five years a virtuous and triumphant Queen; truly religious . . . . and, after a calm and resigned death, she left her mortal part to be deposited in this church, *which she established upon a new footing*." Byron's sarcasm, "he lies like an epitaph," would not be appropriate to this last line. The "new footing" was also a new headship, a new doctrine, a new ritual, a new clergy, a new "modus vivendi," a new everything. We cannot wonder that the (Protestant) chronicler, who approves this royal epitaph, disapproves of the ancient traditions of the Abbey. "There were so many miraculous stories," says the chronicler, "related by monkish writers, that the recital of them now would hardly be endured." The institution of a wedded clergy had disproved them! That the consecration of the Abbey was always believed to be supernatural shows credulity which married canons must compassionate. That Sebert, King of the last Saxons, who died in 616, asked Miletus, Bishop of London, to consecrate the Abbey, but that St. Peter came from heaven to do it, on the night which preceded the proposed ceremony, is a fiction which modern enlightenment rejects; and with at least perfect consistency and Protestant faith. It is due to the late much-respected Dean Stanley,—a refined writer, if not a Catholic Christian,—to say that he speaks without cavil of a tradition which, as a Protestant, he could scarcely believe. "We see in this tradition," writes the Dean, "the union of innocent fiction with worldly craft, which marks so many legends both of Pagan and Christian times." (This is begging the question—but no matter.) "It represents the earliest protest of the Abbots of Westminster against the jurisdiction of the Bishops of London. It was recited by them long afterwards as the solid foundation of the inviolable right of sanctuary in Westminster. It contains the claim established by them on the tithe of the Thames fisheries from Gravesend to Staines. A lawsuit was successfully carried by the Convent of Westminster against the rector of Rotherhithe, in 1282, on the ground that St. Peter had granted the first haul." Now whatever the interpretation which the Dean may put upon all this, one thing remains absolutely certain,—that for centuries the tradition was believed. And we know what was involved in such a belief,—what a simple, yet deep Catholic spirit. Dean Stanley had little sympathy with that sort of spirit—albeit he was a gentleman and a scholar.

Indeed the late dean of Westminster, Arthur Penrhyn Stanley, who now lies in the chapel of Henry VII., was a man of thoroughly "liberal" mind in the educated and the Anglican sense.

He was representative of that school which combines personal culture with a broad—the broadest possible—"theology." His notions of Christianity was that it was an amiable institution for uniting all people of all views. And in this amiable spirit he warmly welcomed to his Abbey the devotee of any Protestant idiosyncrasy. A pupil of Dr. Arnold,—who was reported to have maintained that "his butler had as much power to administer the sacraments as himself,"—Dean Stanley had caught the "breadth" of that conviction, and had consecrated it with his own kindly nature. His argument for the present "breadth" of the Abbey, in regard to tombs, monuments, even creeds, is so good as to be worthy of being set down. He argues that the Abbey is the grandest English national symbol of centuries of change and development; and that just as the constitution is historically chronicled in the monuments, graves, and writings within the Abbey, so the ecclesiastical Abbey at least truthfully embodies ecclesiastical vicissitudes and strifes. We accept the explanation as sufficient. We may not quite approve it as to theory, but there is no doubt of its being accurate as to facts. There are three points of view from which the Abbey may be regarded as national in the Great Britain sense: the royal, the constitutional, the schismatical. The first two senses we may take together, since they have been but temporarily parted for a thousand years. Yet we have to go further back than the beginning of the constitution to learn the beginnings of "Westminster." Whether originally founded by King Sebert (A.D. 616), upon the ruins of a pagan temple of Apollo,—or even possibly, at a still earlier date, purposed, if not founded, by King Lucius,—it is only when we come to King Edward the Confessor that we care to fix the Abbey's paternity. The birth of the Abbey made a new epoch in English history. Religiously, constitutionally, and architecturally, the Abbey was a splendid innovation. It was the first cruciform church built in England. Its massive roofs and pillars (so strangely contrasted with earlier fabrics, with the wooden rafters and beams of Saxon churches) seemed prophetic of that stability which was to mark English Catholicism down to the period of the so-called Reformation. Moreover, it was built "at the royal expense,"—which means, by royal command and with royal aid. "About one-tenth of the property of the kingdom was spent within fifteen years on its infancy." The Abbey also was the "establishment" of the monastic system, in the sense of royal maintenance or endowment; for just as there had been monks in the Minster of the West,—Benedictines established by Dunstan,—so now again the special temper of the royal Abbey became conspicuously the temper of Catholic monks. Add to this, that the King's palace and the King's Abbey

grew together in the closest union and fellowship ("Old Palace Yard" still abuts upon the Abbey), and we have a new formation of the scheme of English royalty, which was "kingship consecrated by Catholicism." Further down in history, many centuries later, Henry III. almost rebuilt the Confessor's Abbey; the central tower, the choir, the transepts, the cloisters, all disappearing from the old scene; and yet the new Abbey was still called the Confessor's Abbey, for his remains were magnificently enshrined in it. The same principle of royal gifts and royal alliance—the harmony of the throne and of the altar—were conspicuous in the second as in the first Abbey; and so vast was the expenditure of Henry III. on the rebuilding, that even his subjects protested against it. Some writers have thought that this protest was the first beginning of what is called "the power of the purse" in the House of Commons; but it is probable that in the stormy reign of Henry III., involving his country in heavy burdens, this particular outlay was but a fragment. Hallam, in his *Middle Ages*, does not allude to it. But Hallam had little sympathy with pious kings. Other historians have been more catholic. Lingard tells us that Henry III. heard three Masses every day; and, when in France, he used to keep the French peers so long waiting, by stopping to hear Mass at every church he passed, that the French king ordered all the churches on the road to be shut. Few Protestants would write graciously of such a monarch. But Dean Stanley has this kindly tribute to a Catholic king—whose motto was "qui non dat quod habet, non accipit ille quod optat"—"His enormous exactions have left their lasting traces on the English constitution, in no less a monument than the House of Commons, which rose into existence as a protest against the king's lavish expenditure on the mighty Abbey which it confronts."

It is this version of Catholic interests with national story—this parallelism of civil and religious life—which is our apology for regarding Westminster Abbey as something more than a mere English Catholic Church. There is no monument in Paris, in Florence, even in Rome, which is its equal in range of suggestiveness. There are many much older monuments in the world, but not one which so epitomizes a nation's life. When the river Thames was the chief highway of English life, the chief inlet and outlet of English commerce, and so came to be called "Father Thames," because it was the father of the Capital City; in the days when the Thames's boundaries were either utterly unpeopled hills, or forests full of wild deer and wild boars; when salmon was caught close to the site of Westminster Abbey, and the "Strand" of the river was almost tenantless; in those days—without attempting to fix a date—the first idea of the Abbey had its birth. And, as we have

said, the king's palace, and the legislature,—both the House of Commons and the House of Lords,—and whatever is comprehended in the word politics, were all twined by association round a Church which to this day is the "Church of the Coronations." The "Stone of Scone"—which, by a pretty tradition, was said to be the stone on which Jacob (or, some thought Abraham) laid his head—is still inclosed in the Coronation Chair; and from Edward I. to Queen Victoria every sovereign has been throned upon it; though in earlier times "the abbot sate there on festivals." Parliament, as we have said, met at Westminster, in one or other of the precincts of the Abbey. Hallam is of opinion that, previous to the thirteenth century, "the Commons sat at the bottom of Westminster Hall, and the Lords occupied the upper end;" and the prelates—among whom would be the Abbot of Westminster—had always their place in the upper House. Thus the Parliament, and the Abbey, and the king's home, and the law courts, were blended in national development. The royal monuments were also blended in the same spirit. They began, it is supposed, with King Sebert, and they ended with Mary and Elizabeth. The two queens were buried in the same grave. Strange yet unhappy reconciliation! The reason why the royal monuments ended with Queen Elizabeth is probably because princes, who up to that time had been supreme, and had been credited with the prescription of "divine right," then ceased to be the sole masters of the people; for between the death of Queen Elizabeth and the birth of the Great Rebellion was only a short space of twenty-two years; so that the growth of the people's power became symbolized in monuments to as many humble as high-born British subjects. Thus historically both the tombs and the monuments mark the epochs of political variety. We may smile when we see a monument to "Tom Browne," or to Mrs. Siddons, in the same church with the shrine of the Confessor; we may ridicule a memento of Courayer, who wrote a vindication of Anglican orders, and who, dying an infidel, does not seem to have had much place in "the Church of the holy traditions;" we may be critical upon monuments to comedians or tragedians, "harlequin figures," as Charles Lamb says, "with inscriptions which cool a farrago of false thoughts and nonsense;" we may ask why courtiers and playwrights, musicians and craftsmen, should be honored along with noisy heretics, or with the mild but schismatical John Wesley. All such misgivings are set at rest by the explanation of Dean Stanley: "The temple of silence and reconciliation exemplified the wide toleration of death—may we not add, the comprehensiveness of the true religion of the Church of England!" We will not cavil at such a kindly explanation. Besides we know that in some Catholic churches—we

may name the Campo Santo at Pisa, and we might name, too, Strasbourg and Rheims—there has been much mutilation of old monuments, and much substitution of new; so that, in point at least of *taste*, we have to admit that Catholic chapters have not always shown regard to the purest harmony; but when we come to the *doctrine* of Catholic piles, the exposition of old truths by new monuments, Catholics cannot plead guilty to such wholesale contradictions as are found in every nook of the London abbey. They may plead guilty to false sentiment, not false doctrine. We allow that Henry III. most ruthlessly destroyed the venerable Norman Church of the Confessor; that Henry VII. razed to the ground the graceful Lady Chapel which Henry III. had so devoutly built up; but it was not from heretical motives that this was done; it was only from a questionable enthusiasm. When we come to the time of the so-called Reformation, we find a new doctrine, with new tastes. There is little now left in the Abbey to show of what religion it is—save only its structural form. No crucifix, no altar of the Blessed Virgin, no holy water stoop, no confessional, no altar lamp, not even an apparent font. The font is stowed away somewhere out of sight. We admit the historic value of the Abbey, but we cannot feel respect for its guardians. In point of age, we know we are in a world of poetry. The origin of most cathedrals is commonplace and prosaic, when compared with the origin of Westminster. Historically it is a storehouse of dynastic changes. Plantagenet and Tudor, Stuart and Oliver Cromwell, Dutch William and Hanoverian George, all have some memento in this "comprehensive" church, which Dean Stanley says is "now the church of the true religion of the Church of England." We must contemplate such a medley with mixed feelings. We may be edified by the union of secular with religious grandeur, which is so picturesquely set forth within the Abbey; by the lesson which is taught by the laying side by side the dust of the most kingly and the most cloistered; by the equal honoring of high virtues and high birth; we may be much interested in being told of the vast political pageants of which the Westminster precincts have been the theatre—of the clash of arms which has pursued fugitive warriors almost within the gates of the Right of Sanctuary; and we may be amused by the record of the wranglings of Anglican divines—overheard from the Chapter House and the Abbot's Place, from the Dining Hall and the Jerusalem Chamber; but when we come to ask, what have modern centuries given us back, in place of the old Catholic Westminster Abbey—well, let Dean Stanley give the answer.

"The English and Scottish Confessions of 1561 and 1643, the English Prayer Book of 1662, and the American Prayer Book of

1789—which derived their origin, in part at least, from our Precincts—have, whatever be their defects, a more enduring and lively existence than any results of the medieval councils of Westminster." Now seeing that these "Confessions" were almost exclusively Presbyterian; that these Prayer Books, partly Zwinglian, partly parliamentary, were substitutes for the Adorable Sacrifice of the Mass; and that any such Protestant services as they contain can be "read" as fittingly in a meeting-house as in a church; we are at a loss to comprehend how a highly cultivated gentleman could express such a fantastic opinion. And yet Dean Stanley was an exalted type of that broad church school of Anglicanism which at this day is dominant in the establishment. He was so broad as to be said to be "Catholic!" "His was a Catholic spirit," wrote a critic in the *Contemporary*, in a recent article on the late respected Dean; and the *Times*, and the *Daily Telegraph*, and the *Standard* gave him the same equivocal praise. It must all depend on what we mean by the word Catholic. And if we can get at this novel apprehension, as advocated by the Dean and his admirers, we shall be able to judge in what sense the new Abbey can be said to be more Catholic than the old Abbey. Let us put the hypothesis in this way: If a man is a Catholic because he believes that an abbey church should both contain a lady chapel and a Protestant pulpit; an altar to St. George or to St. Anthony, and a memorial to Cromwell or to Ireton; a sculpture to St. Edmund or to St. Oswald, and an "in memoriam" of Courayer or William the Third; a shrine of St. Edward the Confessor, and an inscription to the child-king, Edward VI.,—"on earth of the Church of England and Ireland the Supreme Head;" a hundred tokens of one immutable Catholic faith, and a hundred tokens of a hundred mutable Protestant heresies; well, we concede that there may be Catholics of that kind, just as we concede that the recent "Ecumenical Methodist Council" was undoubtedly ecumenical in its own way. Or again, if we should speak of Westminster cloisters, where for centuries monks said their divine office, but where now we see the ladies (and the perambulators) of the extremely comfortable clergy of the Abbey, and also stray amusement-seeking wayfarers, who "tip" a verger for a bit of information, or make a sketch of some fragment of Catholic effigy, we admit that there is an exceptional Catholicism in the apprehension of the identity of exact opposites. Or, once more, when, from the *outside* of the Abbey, we note the structural fitness for Catholic worship,—the maimed rites which have supplanted the old worship seeming to mock both the outside and the in,—we can appreciate what is meant by a Protestant Catholicism—which includes both the Mass and "dearly beloved brethren," cloistered monks and honorable and

reverend married gentlemen, the religion of the Confessor and of Dean Stanley, or a dedication by St. Peter—and by Dr. Tait. It is not with disrespect but with lamentation that we record such nineteenth century oblivion. And it is worth observing, at this point, that the religious services in the Abbey have been for centuries exceptionally Puritan. Pompous as has been the pageantry of coronations, and gorgeous as are the symbols of the monarchy, the services in the Abbey have been, since Oliver Cromwell's days, almost ostentatiously demure. In St. Paul's Cathedral ritualism has found a home; and even Westminster is now beginning to catch the spirit; but for more than two centuries the Abbey has taken a pride in looking like a tomb of the ancients, and in celebrating what has been happily described as "a funeral service over a defunct religion." The fabric was so eloquently Catholic, that the ritual had to be framed to protest against it. Horace Walpole said of the fabric: "Though stripped of its shrines and altars, it is nearer converting one to Popery than all the regular pageantry of Roman domes." The deans and chapters, always knowing this, took good care—and no doubt with perfect success—not to "convert any one to Popery" by the services. Dean Stanley says, in his peculiarly quiet way, when speaking of the mighty change in the nation's faith, "The abbot was converted into a dean." And the dean became mainly a preacher. "The most lovely and lovable thing in Christendom" became a temple for very long sermons. Preaching, not worship, became the ideal. Indeed the congregations must have been in danger sometimes of that calamity, which Sidney Smith has facetiously called "being preached to death." Dr. Barrow, in the time of Charles II., was "only allowed by the dean to preach the first half of his sermon; and that half took him one hour and a half;" and, in the time of Cromwell, a preacher "repeated forty times over that if there were no kings, no queens, no lords, no ladies, no gentlemen, no gentlewomen in the world, it would be no loss at all to the Almighty." After the Restoration, the sermons became more loyal, but none the less lengthy and dry; for even under Queen Anne, a preacher was so long about it, that "the dean jogged a friend who bore him company, and said, 'Let us go home and fetch our gowns and slippers, for I find this man will make night work of it.'" But what else had such men to do but to talk? Dean Stanley has seemed to imply that even such weary pulpit orations might be an improvement on the old uses of the Abbey. Because the sacrifice was not there, therefore everything that *was* there might be endured for the gain of the loss! Besides, had they not the Prayer Book—or one of the many Prayer Books—which had supplanted the Roman Catholic Missal? Had they not men's words, and men's voices, to comfort

them in "the abomination of desolation?" We may wonder at, though we are unable to explain such phenomenal apprehensions of "the Catholic spirit." A spirit which can admire "the council of Presbyterians, with a sprinkling of Independents, dressed in their black hoods and Geneva bands . . . with their thirty lay assessors to overlook the clergy . . . . and which council, having discussed the thirty-nine articles so far as the sixteenth, was commanded by the Parliament to take up the question of the liturgy," can only be Catholic on the ground that it regards the Parliament as the Holy See of divine truth and inerrancy. A spirit which can respect the Westminster Confession, "sanctioned," as Dean Stanley tells us, "by the occasional pressure of the armies of an English king;" or which can meekly bend the head to "the final alterations made by Parliament in the Prayer Book;" and can regard such profane travesties as "more enduring and lively than any results of the medieval councils of Westminster;" or, finally, a spirit which can comment on the horrid sacrilege made on altars, and on everything that was holy or Christian, by the "lay committee" of the illegitimate Queen Elizabeth, with the simple, brief, approving sentence, "the change was now complete," can only be Catholic provided that to be so is to reserve all one's sympathies for Protestantism. Still, the spoliations might have been very much worse; and for such mercies the Dean expresses gratitude. The Catholic Abbey might have been utterly defaced, whereas it was only utterly Protestantized. Just as John Carter, the author of *Ancient Sculptures and Paintings*, found his highest gratification, when contemplating the Abbey, in the fact that "it had not been whitewashed," so the Dean appears content that "the Abbey still stands," though its first purpose—the Holy Mass—has been obliterated. Perhaps we cannot expect more from Anglican deans. The royal, the constitutional Abbey is monumental, and therefore richly interesting to everybody; but, to a Protestant, the Catholic Abbey must be like Cleopatra's needle—a puzzle to Londoners, on the Thames embankment.

Let us dismiss such deeply painful reflections, and conclude with one word of satisfaction. There are Englishmen who can remember the coronation of Queen Victoria, on June 28th, 1838. The Abbey, densely crowded with a pageant of spectators, most of them persons of high rank, was the scene of the inauguration of a perfectly new epoch in the liberties of the Catholics of England. That coronation was the last, but also the first—in the sense of the renewed life of the Catholic Church. In no reign, since that of Henry VII.,—if we except only the short reign of Queen Mary,—have Catholics enjoyed so much quietude as under the mild sway of the amiable Queen Victoria. Of the thirteen sovereigns crowned

in Westminster Abbey, from the time of Queen Elizabeth to the present reign, the only sovereign who has done *no harm* to Catholics is the sovereign who has now reigned forty years. James I., "the learnedest fool in Christendom," and an odd mixture of a Calvinist and a High Churchman; Charles I., a High Churchman because despot; Charles II., secretly a Catholic, though a timid one, and caring more for his lap dogs than for his subjects; James II., a would-be friend to Catholics, but so imprudent as to make Protestants his enemies; William of Orange, a Dutch Calvinist or Predestinarian, whose chief claim to the throne was that he was *not* a Catholic; Queen Anne, a high and dry churchwoman, who remembered the cost of Catholicism to her father; George I. and George II., dull Protestants; George III., a most respectable Nothingarian; George IV., a fine gentleman of pleasure, who opposed the passing of the Catholic Emancipation Act; and William IV., a mere cipher in English history;—all these sovereigns were absolutely worthless to English Catholics, so far as Catholic liberties were concerned. The Catholic Emancipation Act was brought about by political motives, outside the sphere of royal agency. All that the Georges had to do with it was to oppose it. But of Queen Victoria we may say, that she has been the first Protestant sovereign who has never shown any Protestant prejudice; and this is high praise, in Protestant England. Since the 18th of June, 1838, there has been nothing in the conduct of Queen Victoria to cause Catholics to regret her coronation. Westminster Abbey, it is true, contains no special, new feature, imparted to it by the present good Queen; but then the Queen has nothing to do with Westminster Abbey — save only to appoint a new dean; and even this she does only on recommendation. The prime minister is really the dean-maker. Dr. Bradley, who has but just now been appointed, was the personal friend of Mr. Gladstone, and he possesses all that "breadth" which distinguished his predecessor—even if it does not distinguish Mr. Gladstone. Dr. Bradley will protect the "historical" Abbey, but will not in any way change the "religions." He is a scholarly Oxford Don, with those high and dry tendencies which eliminate the soul out of Christianity. Now her majesty, on the contrary, has an immense amount of warm sentiment; which she has exercised largely towards Catholics. Were it not in questionable taste, it would be easy to enumerate personal kindnesses which the Queen has shown to Catholic priests and Catholic laymen. In this respect she is probably the superior of all the sovereigns who have been crowned in Westminster Abbey since Queen Mary. And there would be a fittingness in the restoration of the Abbey to its original and lawful

Catholic guardians, during the reign of the kindly Queen Victoria, —if such an hypothesis can be gravely entertained,—for, now that Catholics have been restored to their just liberties, they might also be restored to their just possessions. Since the death of George II., no English sovereign has been buried within the precincts of Westminster Abbey; but when Queen Victoria comes to die (and may this be far, far away) it would be a beautiful realization if she could rest in peace in the Catholic Abbey, and her requiem be said by Catholic priests, around the altar of her great ancestor, the Confessor. Unlikely as this is, we may yet trace the tokens of an advancing Catholic sentiment in the great metropolis. St. Paul's Cathedral—always a rival of Westminster Abbey, since the days when the two became Protestant—is putting on robes of devotional sentiment, quite distinct from its old cold, hard Protestantism. The services at St. Paul's are most decorous, and its altar, such as it is, is suggestive. The most distinguished of English Catholic architects, Mr. John Francis Bently, has recently designed a cross for the Cathedral, which is placed in one of the side chapels. There is no longer any repugnance to crosses. Breadth has given way to Catholic sentiment. May it give way, before long, in the Abbey. Meanwhile, we shall go on hoping that the Church of the Coronation has not seen the last of Catholic sovereigns; and that the prophecy of the Franciscan monk may be fulfilled,—"After a long winter there shall be a spring."

ARCHBISHOP MacHALE.

Evidences and Doctrines of the Catholic Church. By Most Rev. John MacHale, Dublin: 1827.

Letters to Mr. Canning, Lord John Russell, Lord Stanley, the Times, Newspapers, etc.

TO glance at the career of John MacHale is to go over the history of the most changeful and eventful century that the world has yet known. In the events that mark this time he played, among his own people at least, a great and conspicuous part. He influenced his time, and always in the direction of right and liberty and justice. A man of this kind belongs in a sense to the world as much as to his own people. It is only natural, therefore, to find this Irish prelate's writings and letters and sermons eagerly caught up and translated into foreign tongues; as natural as to find O'Connell accepted by Europe as the type and model of a great liberal statesman,—a man who in the senate and on the public platform did the work that a Washington accomplished in the field.

MacHale was an O'Connell in the priesthood. He was in his own lines as great a statesman as he was an earnest and holy churchman. It is almost an open secret that from the day he first conquered English ears by his bold and vigorous letters on public questions in Ireland, English statesmen before attempting some new experiment in Irish legislation were always anxious to be favored beforehand with the opinion of John MacHale. For they knew him to be a right interpreter and dauntless exponent of the feelings and wishes of his countrymen. "A growl from St. Jarlath's," as the London *Times* used to head his remarkable letters, was sure to be heard through all England, and not with disregard. His influence over his countrymen was second, if second at all, only to that of O'Connell, his sincere friend and admirer, who early dubbed him in his broad, free imagery "the lion of the fold of Judah." It is pleasing to note that in all his long life and through all the changes of time and circumstances, the Irish people, generation after generation, never lost their whole-hearted affection for the man whose life spanned a century of battle for their rights. "He looked just like an old warrior wearing out," said a Protestant gentleman to the writer, describing a visit he paid the archbishop during the late famine year, with a view of devising some joint means of relieving the poverty-stricken districts. And he literally died in harness. One of his last public acts was to disavow and repudiate an impression that had got abroad, that he was unfavorable to the Land League and had denounced the "no rent" manifesto of the League leaders. His secretary was instructed to write to the press that his

grace had "abstained from pronouncing any opinion on that grave question."

It is easy to understand the archbishop's steadfast and rooted hostility to English rule in Ireland. He never disguised that hostility. He never disguised anything, least of all his invincible opposition to open and shameless wrong done in the name of law. When John MacHale was born, an Irish Catholic was still a Pariah in his own land. The penal laws were only lightened a very little. But he was born to stirring times amid the roar of the first French Revolution, and just subsequent to the recognition of the independence of the North American Colonies, two events that did so much to change the face of the world and challenge the rule of kings. Henceforth the people were to have a voice in their government, whether that voice were wisely exercised or not. The breath of freedom was abroad in the world, stirring things greatly and working through some dark and foul channels up to good and to right. It fanned the temples of young MacHale away up in far Mayo, and strengthened his loins for a contest lasting through a patriarchal lifetime.

It was to modern eyes a strange world into which the Mayo peasant's son was born on that Sunday, March 6th, 1791, two years after the formation of the American Union, and five years previous to the issuing of Washington's Farewell Address. John MacHale was a little toddling child of three when the head of Louis XVI. rolled on the block. Pitt's enmity to the French Republic was fully reciprocated in France, and Ireland, as usual in England's foreign complications, showed itself as a dangerous spot in the body politic. Hence it became necessary to do something for her, to throw her some sop by way of granting her relief from the evils under which she groaned.

Those evils were monstrous and abominable. The words are weak rather than strong in describing them. And it is necessary to go into them to some extent, in order to show the character and the worth and the work of the man who to the last day of his long life resolutely battled against them. It is happily almost impossible in these days to realize the intense hatred towards Catholics held by the English government and people, and the intolerable tyranny exercised over the Catholics of Ireland, who formed four-fifths of the population of the country. The spirit of the days of the good Queen Anne still ruled when the "Act to prevent the further growth of Popery" was introduced (1703). The terms of that act made it a penal offence for "any Popish person" to send his children abroad to be educated without special license from the lord lieutenant and from privy councillors. In 1709 it was enacted that "whatsoever person of

the Popish religion shall publicly teach school, or shall instruct youth in learning in any private house within this realm, or shall be entertained to instruct youth in learning . . . . by any Protestant schoolmaster, he shall be esteemed and taken to be a Popish regular clergyman and be prosecuted as such, and incur such pains, penalties, and forfeitures as any Popish regular convict is liable to by the laws and statutes of this realm." The punishment for a regular Popish priest under William III. was transportation, and in case of return to the country death, with the pleasing accompaniment of drawing and quartering, as for high treason. These enlightened enactments were further improved on in the reigns of George II. and George III. It was practically a penal offence to be a Catholic at all, and an unpardonable offence to be an educated Catholic. In 1727 all Catholics in Ireland were excluded from the parliamentary and municipal franchise, and so remained until 1793. They were governed as cattle might be governed, with no more voice than cattle in their lot. In 1737 Ireland was treated to "Townsend's golden drops," so called from the act passed by recommendation of Lord Townsend, then viceroy, to raise the premium for a Catholic priest's apostasy from thirty to forty pounds. In 1758 the lord chancellor announced on the bench, and with reason, that "the laws did not presume a Papist to exist in the kingdom, nor could they breathe without the connivance of the government." Dr. Johnson considered that the ten persecutions of the early Christians were not worse than the savage, the demoniac statutes passed at this period against the Catholics or native race in Ireland. Burke wrote of the "vicious perfection of these laws," which he described as "a machine of wise and elaborate contrivance, and as well fitted for the oppression, impoverishment, and degradation of a people, and the debasement in them of human nature itself, as ever proceeded from the perverted ingenuity of man."

While this magnificent system of government prevailed in Ireland, Irish soldiers were winning distinction in foreign service on the battle-fields of Europe. The battle of Fontenoy (1745) first opened the eyes of George II. to the value of the men whom these laws had banished from the empire. A few concessions began to be made, and these were quickened by the rising of the Jacobites in favor of Charles Edward. But it was still true up to 1775, the year of O'Connell's birth, that "an Irish Papist can neither inherit, acquire, nor bequeath,—for in all these cases he is liable to be defeated or disquieted . . . . A Papist shall not be a divine, a physician, a lawyer, or a soldier; he shall be nothing but a Papist. . . . . If he becomes a trader or mechanic, he shall scarcely enjoy the rights of a citizen; if a farmer, he shall not cultivate or improve

his possession, being discouraged by the short limitations of his tenure."[1] This will sufficiently account for John MacHale being a peasant's son. Catholics could only rise above the condition of helots by subterfuge or connivance with a few kind-hearted Protestants. It accounts also for O'Connell being compelled to seek abroad an education prohibited him at home.

The revolt of the American Colonies again quickened the British government into still further concessions. The existence of Catholic clergy began to be tolerated. In 1771 the British government had grown so liberal as to allow Catholics in Ireland to take a lease of fifty acres of bog and half an acre of arable land for a house, provided the holding was not within a mile of any town. What a condition for a people! As soon as France acknowledged the independence of the American Colonies a bill for the partial relief of Catholics was passed, and Catholic schoolmasters were allowed to open schools by obtaining a license from the Protestant bishop of the diocese. England's foreign difficulties and the formation of the Irish volunteers for the protection of the coasts showed to both England and Ireland how important a part of the empire was the latter country. This led to Grattan's demand for legislative independence, claiming that the Irish were a free people, that the kingdom of Ireland while attached to the imperial crown is a distinct kingdom, "with a parliament of her own, the sole legislature thereof;" that the king, lords, and commons of Ireland should govern Ireland, and that no parliament should govern the country but the Parliament of Ireland. This perfectly right and natural demand was granted in 1782, and an Irish Parliament assembled in College Green to legislate on Irish home affairs. Englishmen now call it traitorous to agitate for a demand already conceded by the English crown and legislature. The subsequent history of the Irish Parliament and the manner in which the act of Union with England was brought about in 1801 call for no detailed mention here. To say that the Irish Parliament was all that could be desired would be to close one's eyes to the facts. In the first place, four-fifths of the nation were unrepresented in it. The Catholics had no voice there any more than they had in the English Parliament. Ireland was governed by a dominant Protestant minority, much as France is governed to-day by an atheistic minority. Circumstances sometimes combine to favor such abortions of legislation. The Catholic petition for the redress of grievances and removal of disabilities was rejected by this parliament of a minority. This led to the formation of the Society of United Irishmen, their

[1] Smyth's Ireland, Historical, and Statistical. From Earl Macartney's Pamphlet, written in 1773.

negotiations with the French government, and the disastrous rising of 1798.

John MacHale lived through these scenes, which unquestionably produced a lasting impression on the receptive mind of the lad. He hardly remembered the arrival of the French fleet, under Hoche, in Bantry Bay in 1796. But he did remember the insurrection, its most cruel repression, and the tardy landing of Humbert's small force in 1798. He remembered their march on Ballina; and he remembered the horrible incident of a Catholic priest at Crossmolina, who had given some refreshment to a couple of French officers, being afterwards taken and hanged at Castlebar. Castlebar was where MacHale received the first rudiments of the classics at the age of twelve or thirteen. Previous to that—thanks to the laws of an enlightened empire—he was compelled to study under a hedge. A "hedge schoolmaster" was, literally, the future archbishop's first instructor, and of all the instructors that ever were, surely those are of the noblest who went from district to district, braving the cruel laws, trying gently to cheat them, living on the charity of the poor, and with the single purpose of imparting such light of knowledge and of faith as they possessed to the persecuted little ones of Christ.

It is wonderful how a people will live and grow under the severest conditions. They are open and sensible to the lightest pressure. The Relief Acts of 1774 and 1778 were already working wonders among the Catholics of Ireland. They afforded a gleam of hope, and no people in the world will cling to even a phantom of hope as will the Irish. Catholics who were in trade invested such savings as they had scraped together in land, and soon quite an important body of Catholics showed themselves in the chief cities,—men of means, of will, and of intelligence. Yet in the year of John MacHale's birth all the Catholics of Ireland could not find a member of the Irish Parliament to present their annual petition for a removal of disabilities. Edmund Burke presented a deputation of Irish Catholics to George III., who received them favorably, and a relief act was passed in 1793 by which Catholics were admitted to the franchise. The admission, however, only allowed them to vote for a Protestant. At the same time Catholics were admitted to take degrees in Trinity College, but were allowed no place in the board or body corporate, or as professors or fellows. The professions, with somewhat similar restrictions, were also opened to Catholics. A Catholic was allowed to practice at the outer bar, but could not be a king's counsel or a judge. And the College of Physicians closed their ranks against all Catholic intruders, by making it a rule that a degree of arts in the Dublin University was a necessary qualification for a fellowship. As a Catholic could

not obtain such a degree, he was necessarily excluded from fellowship, and this state of things continued down to 1843. Admission was free to the army and navy, save certain grades, as also to the magistracy. The ecclesiastical College of Maynooth was founded and endowed by the government in 1795.

Meanwhile young MacHale was picking up knowledge under a hedge. Thence he went to Castlebar, where, under the new concessions, a school had been opened. Here he remained about two years, getting what smattering he could of the classics. Discovering the divine vocation, he was sent to Maynooth in 1807, being then sixteen years old.

The boy's mind was wonderfully acquisitive. He had that greed for knowledge that is one of the chief characteristics of his race. No nation has deeper reverence for learned men than the Irish, and none a keener appreciation of intellectual worth. A dull speaker, a poor actor, an indifferent singer may capture an Irish audience once, by accident and for politeness sake, but never a second time; while the faults, or even vices, of those with any worth in them at all are nowhere more charitably condoned than among this people. It was not MacHale, it was all his race that flew to the founts of knowledge—knowledge of any kind as soon as they were opened to them. It was a love of knowledge for knowledge sake rather than with a view to advancement in life. Even Mr. Froude testifies to this noble characteristic of the race, and recounts how the Kerry boys, who could often hardly speak the English tongue, were well versed in their Latin and their Greek.

In Maynooth the young student's mind received the careful drill and discipline needed to polish and round it, and make it a complete and perfect instrument. His advance was rapid and remarkable. Whatever came to him his mind assimilated. The classics opened up to his imaginative yet solidly cast mind a new and delightful world. Homer he loved as a friend and master, and later on occupied such leisure moments as he could snatch from a life full of exacting labor to turn the old Greek into mellifluous Irish. He did the same with Moore's Melodies and with portions of the Bible. His native tongue he prized above all tongues, as he prized his own land above all lands. An amusing instance of this was given the writer by a friend who wrote to the archbishop some years back, begging him to settle a disputed point. The dispute was with an English acquaintance, and it arose over the archbishop's knowledge of his native tongue. The Englishman insisted that Archbishop MacHale knew no Irish at all, and that the stories told of him in this regard were fiction. A bet was the result, and the archbishop himself was written to as the one most competent to decide. With his usual kindness and sense of fun he sent back a

prayer-book to the writer of the letter; a prayer-book printed half in English, half in Irish, and translated by his own hand. With the prayer book came a letter saying that in his cathedral he always preached to his people in English and Irish, his sermons usually occupying about thirty minutes. Ten of those minutes he devoted to English and the remaining twenty to Irish, which he considered about a just proportion, not in preaching alone, but in all things.

His success in the higher range of philosophical and theological studies was no less marked than in the classics, and he was soon called to assist Dr. Delahogue, a learned French *emigré* whom the Revolution had banished from France, in the chair of dogmatic theology. At twenty-three he was ordained priest by Dr. Murray, the archbishop of Dublin. Soon after, Dr. Delahogue's health failing, the young priest succeeded him in the professorial chair, which he occupied up to 1825, when he was called to assist Dr. Waldron, the bishop of Killala, as coadjutor, with right of succession, and was consecrated under the title of Bishop of Maronia *in partibus*.

MacHale's career at Maynooth as student and professor thus stretched from 1807 to 1825. Those were eventful years in the world and eventful years in Ireland. MacHale, though a model of piety through all his life, was by no means a cloistered recluse. Piety and patriotism were to him equivalent terms, or twin loves rather. His keen gray eyes had not been closed on the world all these years, nor did the walls of Maynooth shut out the scenes and sounds of the conflicts raging abroad. He could never forget the scenes of his early youth, and his heart burned within him as he witnessed the degradation of his country and the disabilities heaped upon the men of his race and faith. This resentment deepened as knowledge grew upon him and showed him the bitter injustice of it all. This Irishman could never bring himself to see that there should be a good law for the Englishman, but a bad law for his own countrymen; a good law for the Irish Protestant, but a bad one for the Irish Catholic. His desire, which became one of the chief aims of his life, was to see Catholic and Protestant on a position of political equality.

It was at a meeting of Catholics held in Dublin in January, 1800, that O'Connell, then a young man of twenty-five, rose to make his maiden speech in public. The speech was in opposition to the proposed destruction of the native parliament and projected union between Great Britain and Ireland. It had been charged against the Catholics that they were in league with the government against the union, with the understanding that they should be granted emancipation. This charge O'Connell denounced as a calumny

against his coreligionists, and declared that they would rather reject emancipation than accept the union. The union went, nevertheless, and the legislative power over Irish affairs was transferred to an English Parliament. In 1809 a general committee of Catholics was formed, with the Earl of Fingal at the head. O'Connell was an active member, but the association was opposed and its efforts were rendered futile by the government. The failure of this led O'Connell to form the new Irish Catholic Association in 1823, which was to unite the Catholics of all the country in active co-operation for the removal of their disabilities.

The clergy had thus far stood aloof from at least any open participation in the agitation for the people's rights. But the events abroad had stirred men. The Napoleonic wars were now over; Napoleon was fast in St. Helena; and the reform movement in England, which lay in abeyance during those wars, was now taken up and pressed forward with a new vigor under the leadership of Lord John Russell. In 1822 a famine occurred in Ireland, and the wretched condition of the country was to some extent brought home to the English people. Still nothing was done to relieve the Catholics. A series of letters under the now famous initials J. K. L. had appeared in the press, full of forceful and eloquent pleading against the iniquity of the penal laws, and exposing with faultless logic the injustice done to the Irish people. They raised an embittered controversy both in England and Ireland. They were a great aid to the cause and scheme that O'Connell had at heart. In defence of an unusually violent attack on J. K. L. appeared a letter signed *Hierophilos*. From that time forth the name of *Hierophilos* became in the controversies of the time as well known as that of J. K. L. As is now known one of the writers was the illustrious Dr. Doyle, the bishop of Kildare and Leighlin, the other a young professor in the new foundation of Maynooth, and destined to become the future archbishop of Tuam. "Hierophilos" soon changed to "John of Maronia," then to "John of Killala," and finally to the world-renowned "John of Tuam."

The famine raised the hopes of Protestants in England and Ireland. It was thought that the Catholics, one-third of whom consisted of indigent poor, might be starved into conversion, and sell their souls for a basin of soup. Associations with this apostolic end in view were formed, the most notable of which was the Kildare Street Association, whose avowed purpose was to evangelize the Irish peasants after the manner indicated. Against such people and their practices both Dr. Doyle and Professor MacHale sharpened their pens to venom. To North, a lawyer of some note and a prominent member of the association, who had asserted that the Scriptures were perfectly plain to him, MacHale wrote:

"You have discovered no difficulties in the Scriptures. I will not suppose you have not read them, it would be injurious to your party; though it must be confessed that the genius of your piety is fonder of lingering on Parnassus than on Zion [North was inflated and pompous in his style]. Were I to assure you that I found no difficulties in the law, and hence it was obvious to each individual, you might be inclined to bend the gravity of your muscles. What may be clear to some may be comparatively obscure to others, and while the mind of Mr. North sheds a train of glory over the paths of its inquiry, others must grope their way by the feeble light of criticism and conjecture."

It was not to men like North and associations like that of Kildare Street that the young professor confined his attentions. He attacked everything, for everything in the government's treatment of the Irish people invited attack. Like Dr. Doyle, Professor MacHale was summoned before committees and examined as to his letters, which were then regarded much in the light of treason, the style of studies in Maynooth, the condition of his countrymen, and the like. The committees in both cases received considerably more information than they anticipated, and there was truth as well as humor in the Duke of Wellington's remark when asked if "Doyle, the Popish bishop, was still under examination by the Lords." "No, by ——," was the duke's answer, "but the Lords are still, I regret to say, under examination by Doyle, the Popish bishop." Here is how "Hierophilos" wrote to Canning:

"It cannot be pretended that the policy which has been adopted towards Ireland was ever inspired by the charity of the Christian religion. In vain does England boast that her councils are guided by justice, tempered by freedom, and softened by religion. In her conduct towards Ireland I have proved that she has departed from all. Without any necessity, she still closes against Catholics the portals of the constitution, in defiance of Locke, of Blackstone, of Paley, and other great names whom they venerate as the oracles of her legislation. Notwithstanding her boasted freedom, as far as it regards Ireland it has been all that was harsh, intolerant, exclusive, and imperious, in the ancient republics."

These were bold utterances in those days, and acted on the Irish people as well as on the English ministry. Every letter was stamped with the same spirit,—the spirit of a free man armed with the keenest reasoning faculty, and not to be stifled or strangled at the mandate of a government foreign to his country and his people. His letters established his fame abroad, while his learning and ability in the college had already marked him out for promotion; and on the appeal of the bishop of Killala for a coadjutor, Professor MacHale was selected to assist him.

In the wider field he now entered he came still more prominently forward as a resolute and dauntless champion of the people's rights. Dr. Doyle and Archbishop Murray had already joined the Catholic Association, and this step exercised a great influence on the movement through all Ireland. The association progressed with wonderful rapidity. It had branches in every parish. A Catholic rent

of £50,000 a year was raised for the objects of the association. Of this sum, £5000 was annually set apart for the education of Catholic priests for Irish emigrants in America, as if with a prophetic instinct of what was to follow. A similar sum was devoted to the education of the Catholic poor. Fifteen thousand pounds were allotted to the press organ of the association, and a like sum to cover law proceedings. Five thousand pounds covered the parliamentary expenses, there being a London agency for the presentation of petitions and so forth, and another five thousand were expended on the erection of chapels and parochial houses in poor localities.

The association soon covered Ireland, and its funds were poured into it freely. The government suddenly found itself confronted with a popular power and popular leaders whom it could not disregard. Instead of granting the reasonable demands of the people, it undertook, as in our own days, to suppress the association, condemning it as unlawful. But O'Connell's ingenuity in driving his famous coach and four through any act of parliament saved it, and the government found itself defeated.

By aid of this great engine the movement for Catholic emancipation was pressed on with irresistible force against all the power of the British government and people. The Catholic bishops of Ireland petitioned the government to inquire into the whole question of Irish education. A royal commission was appointed for that purpose, June 14th, 1824, and one of the principal witnesses cited to report on the royal College of Maynooth was the newly appointed coadjutor bishop of Killala. The testimony regarding his early studies is most interesting as descriptive of the man:

"The commissioners understand that you at one time filled one of the professors' chairs of Maynooth?

"'I did.'

"'You did so until a very late period?'

"'Until June or July, 1825.'

"'You held it about five years?'

"'I held the situation of professor for five years. I was first lecturer or assistant to Dr. Delahogue for six years, and then I became professor on his resignation; altogether I delivered lectures for eleven years.'

"'Were you, at all, connected with the college previously to that?'

"'I had been a student there, seven years before.'

"'From what diocese was you recommended?'

"'From the diocese of Killala.'

"'At what place of education had you been previously to being admitted into Maynooth?'

"'At Castlebar.'

"'How long were you there?'

"'I should think nearly two years.'

"'Into what class did you enter at Maynooth?'

"'In the second class of humanity.'

"'Had you, in the short space of two years, been able to acquire so much acquaint-

ance with the Greek and Latin languages as to enable you to be placed in the second class of humanity?'

"'Yes; I do not think the time was much longer than two years; I was reading classics in a country school for six months before I went to Castlebar.'

"'Has any part of your study been in foreign countries?'

"'No; I have never been on the Continent.'"

Such was the kind of man that the government had refused education to for centuries. He was simply a type and example of the swiftness with which his countrymen seize upon their opportunities and turn them to the best advantage. What was thought of "Hierophilos" best appears from a portion of the same examination:

"'Had not the letters of "Hierophilos" been in the course of appearing for two or three years in the newspapers, prior to the appearance of the letter to Mr. Canning (Foreign Secretary from 1823, Prime Minister, in 1827)?'

"'They were in the course of appearing from the year 1820.'

"'Then through the course of four years at least the letters of "Hierophilos" had been before the public?'

"'Yes.'

"'At the time you published the letter to Mr. Canning, are we to understand that you had been actually recommended for the appointment of bishop?'

"'I had been recommended, I dare say, two years before. I had been recommended to Rome three or four years before my appointment. When I was understood to be the author of "Hierophilos," I would not have been recommended if there was anything in these letters that was thought of an improper tendency.'"

O'Connell feeling himself strong enough at last issued his famous address to the Clare electors, June 24th, 1828, and startled the world by daring to aspire to a seat in the Parliament that undertook to transact the affairs of his country. The result is known. Peel in his four hours' speech introducing the Catholic Relief Bill in the House of Commons (March 5th, 1829), said:

"Sir, I have for years attempted to maintain the exclusion of the Roman Catholics from Parliament and the high offices of state. I do not think it was an unnatural or unreasonable struggle. I resign it, in consequence of the conviction that it can be no longer advantageously maintained. . . . . I yield, therefore, to a moral necessity, which I cannot control, unwilling to push resistance to a point which might endanger the (Church) establishment which I wish to defend."

And here it is not foreign to the subject, while it is profoundly instructive in view of the present condition of Ireland, to quote the opinions of the Duke of Wellington on introducing the same bill into the House of Lords. He had more bitterly opposed it than Peel even, but like him had to yield to necessity or put before the house as an alternative civil war, to avoid which he avowed himself willing to sacrifice his life. There is nothing in his opinion "which destroys property and demoralizes character to the degree that civil war does." And as for the people on whom, as to-day, the

English press and certain sections of the English public urged the government to wage this cruel war, the Duke of Wellington thus testifies in words too little known and considered:

"It is already well known to your lordships, that of the troops which our gracious sovereign did me the honor to intrust to my command at various periods, ... at least one half were Roman Catholics. My lords, when I call your recollection to this fact, I am sure all further eulogy is unnecessary. . . . . We must also confess that without Catholic blood and Catholic favor no victory could ever have been obtained." . . . .

He goes on to say that if on the eve of any of "those hard-fought days" he had addressed his Roman Catholic troops in the spirit of the government, thus:

"You well know that your country either so suspects your loyalty, or so dislikes your religion, that she has not thought proper to admit you amongst the ranks of her citizens; if on that account you deem it an act of injustice on her part to require you to shed your blood in her defence, you are at liberty to withdraw. I am quite sure, my lords, that however bitter the recollections which it awakened, they would have spurned the alternative with indignation; for the hour of danger and glory is the hour in which the gallant, the generous-hearted Irishman best knows his duty, and is most determined to perform it."

But he adds, had they chosen to desert, no efforts could have crowned the English arms with victory. He said: "It is mainly to the Irish Catholic that we all owe our proud pre-eminence in our military career," and confessed that whenever, as he almost daily did, he met with any of those brave men and saw them "branded with the imputation of divided allegiance, still degraded beneath the lowest menial, and still proclaimed unfit to enter within the pale of the Constitution," he felt almost ashamed of the honors which had been lavished upon him.

The Catholic Relief Bill was passed, and the first great rent made in the iron chain of the Penal Laws. Bishop MacHale's influence in aiding the movement had been very considerable, and O'Connell's letters to him testify the esteem in which he held him as a friend and co-laborer in the national cause. That friendship was never broken till death parted them, and the prelate's advice was constantly sought by O'Connell in all the movements he subsequently entered on.

While at Maynooth MacHale had published his work on *The Evidences and Doctrines of the Church*, which ran into several editions, and was translated into French and German.

In 1831 he paid his first visit to Rome, whither his fame had preceded him. There he preached a course of sermons, which were taken up and translated into Italian by the Abbot de Lucca, Apostolic Nuncio at Vienna. While on his travels he wrote home a series of letters descriptive of the people and scenes through which he passed. These letters were much admired, and

showed that the bishop was something beside a controversialist and polemical writer. Scarcely had he returned than he donned his armor again. A state of famine was more or less chronic in his country, and the chief blame for that miserable condition of things he rightly laid at the door of the foreign government. While the peasants were starving, or on the verge of starvation, they were compelled to pay tithes for the support of a church alien to themselves and to their faith. How long it takes in history to remove such wicked abuses! Dr. MacHale laid the axe to the root of the matter by flatly refusing to pay tithes, thus setting a conspicuous example to the whole people. In one of his final letters to Lord John Russell on the subject he laid out the following plan of action:

"I shall freely declare my own resolve. I have leased a small farm, just sufficient to qualify me for the exercise of the franchise, in order to assist my countrymen in returning those, and those alone, who will be their friends, instead of being what the representatives usually are, their bitterest enemies. I must, therefore, confess that after paying the landlord his rent, neither to parson, nor to agent, nor to any other individual, shall I consent to pay, in the shape of tithe or any other tax, one penny which shall go to the support of the greatest nuisance in this or any other country."

The tithes were finally abandoned, but as usual as a matter of unavoidable necessity, not as an act of justice and good sense. The question of national education next came up, and here Dr. MacHale took a decided stand, and impressed his views and policy upon O'Connell.

Bishop MacHale's position, as also that of Dr. Doyle and O'Connell, was briefly this: that for the Catholics of Ireland, that is to say, for four-fifths of the nation, there should be a system of Catholic education; that this was owing to them in right and justice. The spirit of proselytism was abroad, and was encouraged by the English government. People who tried to buy souls for a basin of soup were not likely to neglect such an opportunity as the control of a nation's education would place in their hands. Consequently the bishop suspected, and with reason, any "mixed" scheme of national education. It must be remembered that Catholics in England and Ireland stand to-day in very different relations politically from those they occupied at a period when emancipation had only just been forced from the government. The Protestant minority was still the dominant power in the land. The government system was finally adopted, and resulted not so much in a mingling of Catholic and Protestant pupils as in a practically complete separation of the two classes. All things considered, it were better to be openly honest in both regards. Oddly enough the well-known phrase "godless education," which is on every lip to-day, originated in this dispute. It fell from the lips

of a Protestant, not of a Catholic, but was taken up and accepted by O'Connell as a happy condensation of the case. It fell from Sir Robert Inglis, member of Parliament for Oxford University, in denouncing the system of Queen's colleges as a "gigantic scheme of godless education." What Dr. MacHale, who had by this time succeeded to the see of Tuam on the death of Dr. Kelly in 1834, thought of the scheme may be gathered from the following letter to Sir Thomas Reddington, in declining an offer to appoint him visitor to the Queen's College:

"SIR: I am in receipt of your letter of the 3d instant, stating that you are directed by the lord lieutenant to inform me that the Queen has been pleased, by warrant under her majesty's sign manual, to appoint me to be a Visitor of the Queen's College, Galway. Having the strongest conviction that the aforesaid college in Galway, together with the other Queen's colleges in Ireland, is fraught with grievous and intrinsic dangers to the faith and morals of such of the Catholic youth as may resort to them,—a conviction in which I am fortified by the repeated solemn condemnation of those institutions by the successor of St. Peter, who has commanded the Catholic bishops of Ireland to take no part in forwarding them,—I could not without a betrayal of the sacred duty I owe to the flock confided to my care, as well as the guilt of disobedience to the head of the Church, accept the proffered office. Were I even free to accept it without a risk of disobedience, I feel that, far from diminishing, I should be augmenting, the inherent evils of those institutions by giving a sanction to professing Catholics to associate themselves with the enemies of our faith, and thus give them effectual aid in carrying out a system fatal to religion under the specious pretence of affording it protection. I beg, therefore, respectfully to decline the office of Visitor of the Queen's College, and have the honor to be your obedient servant,

"† JOHN, Archbishop of Tuam."

O'Connell welcomed emancipation as a stepping-stone to repeal of the union, which simply meant giving Ireland control over its own affairs, such as had previously been granted by the Crown, but with the changed condition that all the Irish people should have adequate representation in the Irish Parliament. Dr. MacHale was heart and soul with him in this, and remained so to his dying day. The history of the repeal agitation and its failure is known. O'Connell, broken in health and heart, staggered to the English Parliament to make a last appeal for his countrymen, then under the dread shadow of the famine, and went abroad to die. That famine (1845–47), like all the famines that afflict the Irish people, is directly traceable to a government whose system of laws invites such awful visitations, while it takes no adequate measures to prevent them, but when the worst comes to the worst relies on the charity of foreign peoples to come forward and save the lives of its starving subjects.

During those dread years the Archbishop stood at his post, as did all his brethren of the episcopacy and clergy. The action of the English government during the time of trial certainly did not tend to soften his opinion of its complete unfitness to deal with

Irish questions. Again, as in 1822, the Protestant missionary societies swarmed into the country with their soup and their Bibles, especially into the more afflicted districts, comprising the Archbishop's own ecclesiastical domain of the West. The missionary funds to "evangelize" the starving Irish overflowed. Enormous sums were raised to assist the dying people, provided they drank in Protestantism with their soup. A premium was set on starving apostasy. No gospel, no relief. And this was Christian charity and philanthropy! How the Archbishop of Tuam received and welcomed such assistance may be imagined. Thousands of conversions were reported, and the heart of England, that had not been saddened by the famine, was gladdened by the good tidings of the success of the soup-gospellers. Cheered by such news, Archbishop Whately, who was the principal compiler of the books of the Irish National School Board, boasted triumphantly to William Nassau, Senior, that it was the use of those books that prepared the Irish for the wholesale conversions reported. When examined into the whole miserable business turned out to be a fraud. The Irish people died rather than betray their conscience. Perhaps this helped more towards the disestablishment of the Anglican Church in Ireland than anything else. "Have you made her Protestant?" asked John Bright, scornfully, in urging the Disestablishment Bill in 1869. "No! Where you were in the days of Elizabeth you are to-day. So far from making her Protestant, Ireland is the most ultramontane, as I believe, country on the face of the globe. Then cut it down! Why cumbereth it the ground?"

From the famine, the loss of O'Connell, and the abortive rising of the Young Irelanders, Ireland suffered so much that it sank into a sleep of lethargy resembling death. As a means of rousing the exhausted people Lord John Russell brought forward his wholly absurd Ecclesiastical Titles Act, and raised a new "No Popery" cry, which, as usual, was eagerly caught up by a large section of the English people, the professed friends of liberty, of civil and religious freedom, all over the globe. Catholic prelates in Great Britain and Ireland were forbidden by law to use their ecclesiastical titles or promulgate papal decrees, and all because Dr. Wiseman chose to assume the title of Archbishop of Westminster, where the seat of his diocese lay. At once a growl indeed was heard from the old lion of St. Jarlath's. As in the tithe case, so here, he openly defied the unjust law, and hastened to send out a letter denouncing it, signed with the old bold signature, "John of Tuam." A letter from Rome arrived just at this juncture requiring to be read by all the pastors in Ireland. Dr. MacHale mounted his pulpit. "I will not," he said, "place any of my priests in a position from which I might be supposed to have shrunk in my own.

person. Therefore I will violate the Ecclesiastical Titles Act by reading in my cathedral a forbidden proclamation, and I hereby invite all whom it may concern to set the law in motion against me." The law thought it best not to interfere, and John of Tuam remained John of Tuam to the last.

The earlier scenes and struggles of the Archbishop's life have been dwelt on with some minuteness in order to show the actual condition from which he helped his country and people to emerge. As years grew upon him and a new and somewhat improved condition of things arose, the venerable man on whom the weight of time and the ceaseless toil of a long life were pressing firmly though gently, gradually withdrew from public politics and devoted himself chiefly to the affairs of his large diocese. Nevertheless, his counsel was always sought and was never found wanting by those who strove to bring about some measure of good to the country, nor did his pen wholly rust, though less active than before. He assisted at the Council of the Vatican, and was one of those who exercised the freedom of debate there afforded by giving his judgment against the opportuneness of the definition of Papal infallibility. But once the Holy Spirit had spoken through the council, he was one of the first to promulgate the decision among his flock. In June, 1875, occurred his jubilee, or fiftieth anniversary of his consecration, at which the whole Irish race may be said to have assisted. A marble statue of the people's prelate was unveiled in Tuam, and a beautifully illuminated address was presented by the Catholic members of Parliament. The address was delivered by Mr. A. M. Sullivan in a speech of great eloquence. As the orator truly said: "There is no public man at present living who can so fearlessly look into the past, and so confidently seek there his triumphant vindication, as this illustrious man beside whose statue I now stand. As the eagle may gaze on the sun, so may the eye of John of Tuam gaze into all the past of his life, and be there undimmed by a trace of inconsistency,—a public act that he could regret or wish amended."

It was in this same year that the centennial of O'Connell was celebrated in Dublin, and indeed wherever the Irish race was spread. At the Dublin celebration the most honored and venerable figure was that of the great leader's steadfast friend and supporter, John of Tuam. As he passed through the streets of Dublin he was greeted with an ovation by the populace. Little children, as well as aged men, seemed to know by instinct the noble face and figure of the man whom the hero long since passed away had named "the lion of the fold." A similar ovation greeted him when he rose to make a speech at the banquet, and the sounds and the sentiment of the speech breathed the old free air of the Connemara

hills as side by side with the Liberator he proclaimed from their summits or from under their shadow the great doctrine of Repeal. The whole company rose with him as he responded to "the memory of O'Connell." He hailed the event of the celebration as "one of the most significant and cheering presages of the nation's approaching autonomy, exercising the right of self-government, which no people ever lost to any extent, without being, in a corresponding degree, treated as slaves." This was the keynote to the whole speech, the speech of a prelate-statesman. Speaking of O'Connell's example and influence, and looking to the changed condition of things, he said: "If the energy of one man succeeded in lifting the inert mass of a nation out of a state of torpor, and infusing into it the life of freedom, now felt by thousands of its children, who can calculate the magnificent results to the people's prosperity when those thousands of freemen are placed at the starting-point in the new race, now to be run, to reach the goal of the complete autonomy of Ireland?" The liberty sought by O'Connell he claimed to be that large liberty of the Catholic heart which, having broken the chains that bound the Catholic, "could not view with a tranquil indifference the Protestant or Dissenter, of whatever kind, whose tenets were not subversive of social order, excluded from the protection and honors of the state."

That was the last great public appearance of John of Tuam. He retired to his native hills and spent his declining days in patriarchal simplicity among the flock that fairly worshipped him. His heart was saddened by another dread famine, that of 1879. As a mark of the confidence and esteem in which he was held large sums of money collected in this country were sent directly to him for the relief of his people, without passing through the hands of any committee or caretakers. "He was to my mind the very picture of one of the patriarchs of old," said a distinguished American priest to the writer, "or like one of the Christian bishops of the early centuries, living and laboring from night to day wholly among his people." There he was at home, all gentleness and kindness. His visitations of his diocese were gala days for the people. They would flock out in crowds to welcome him wherever he went, and his presence among them was like the sunshine. There habitually accompanied him what might be called a body-guard of beggars, who lived on his bounty, and knew no other father than he. During his long life he built or rebuilt over a hundred churches in his diocese, and the hand of John of Tuam will be long remembered with honor in the West as that that upheld the faith and its freedom through an episcopate of more than half a century.

It has only been possible here to give the barest outlines of so large a life, which has written its own story in such firm and lumi-

nous characters on the scroll of time. He will always be held up as the model of a patriot priest. And how much more nobly does such a life stand out in the world's history than those of so many men, the accomplishment of whose often petty and generally selfish ambitions, has earned for them the title of Great. By the measure of true manhood John MacHale was very great; great in his dauntless courage, great in his singleness of purpose, great in his faith, great in his patriotism, great in his piety and learning. There was not a grain of smallness in all the man's being, nor a small act in all his long life. He was a whole-souled man in everything he undertook. With the same earnestness and profound conviction that he bent before the altar of God, he rose up and turned to face an empire and its statesmen and rebuke them for their oppression and wrongdoing. He had the large and all-embracing heart of a mother for his people; and it was this delicate union of womanly tenderness with manly strength that made up the sweet, simple, perfect character of John MacHale. It is hard to think that the noble figure has at last sunk below the horizon that it so long illumined, standing out with such sharp distinctness from the hurried and blurred surface of our days with its resolute head touched tenderly by the hand of Time, its firm yet tender mouth, its deep-set eyes looking luminously out of a wholly honest soul, the feet planted away in another century, but the face looking ever hopefully forward to the dawn of the brighter century to come. He died November 7th, 1881.

PROTESTANT ISMS AND CATHOLICITY IN THE UNITED STATES.

Dictionary of Religious Denominations. By Dr. Roswell Hitchcock.
Progress of Christianity in the United States. By Dr. Philip Schaff.
Princeton Review, 1879.
Catholic World. New York, 1871.
Sadlier's Almanac and Directory, 1881.

ANY one reading attentively the works of the well-known Lord Macaulay, cannot fail to observe that if, of all the British essayists treating of kindred subjects, he is thought by non-Catholics to be one of the most impartial critics of Catholicity, he is in reality one of the worst, because most covert, perpetuators of the modern English contempt of Catholics; and still he is a writer who is his own best refutation by the numerous testimonies he gives to the venerable Church of the ages. No man can so well answer Macaulay as Macaulay. When he has made a thrust at you with his keen polemical sword, ere the blow has fairly fallen you find his sword-handle in your grasp, to return him a Roland for his Oliver. Such is the fortunate propensity of so many able non-Catholic writers to witness against the sects and for the Church, that Dr. F. W. Marshall's *Christian Missions* is considered simply unanswerable from the fact that of the eleven hundred volumes cited in its composition nine hundred and forty-seven are written by non-Catholics. In a humorous light it is Shakespeare's episode of Prince Henry and Poins, who, it will be remembered, put up poor Jack Falstaff to rob the moneyed travellers, and who, having retaken the booty, were compelled to restore it to the royal treasury. In these pages non-Catholics—even bishops, doctors, and ministers—shall testify to the downfall or emasculation of their own and their fellow-Protestants' isms.

"A house divided against itself shall fall," is not only Scripture, but also experience of every day.

Protestantism is that divided house, and its severed members testify against it now to show its more and more nearly approaching dissolution, as its first builders imitated the upraisers of Babel and were confounded in their tongues and separated in their tribes, forever. Of the first three Protestant isms, Lutheranism can claim no solidarity with Calvinism; their first principles are as divergent

as the north and the east. Neither can Calvinism any more claim common life with Anglicanism, than Anglicanism can with Catholicity. All sects—that is, cut off from different parts of the tree which was to overshadow the nations; sections clipped off the rock of Peter, they fell of their own dead weight, and they never will coalesce among themselves any more than they will reunite with their first source of life, unless they revivify by shaking off their independent death and putting on the common life of unity with the parent trunk, or the Rock of Ages.

These three divisions were subdivided in the lifetime of their founders or shortly after their death: Lutherans into seven or eight sects, Calvinists into five or six, Anglicans into fully as many before the end of the reign of Elizabeth, who was really the foundress and establisher of the ism in its separate form as both schism and heresy. Thus we have at least eighteen or twenty denominations or religious fractions within fifty years of their primitive foundation. These have produced upwards of three hundred offshoots in as many years. We seem, however, to be wasting time showing the defenders of the Reformation that their hundreds of sects are destructive of the ground principle of Christianity, viz., unity of doctrine, one code of morals. We have advanced so far that many not only seem to think but do think that the multiplicity of opposing sections of "believers" is a positive advantage.

The United States is truly the paradise of propagation of indefinite numbers and shades of denominations. There are nearly as many in the Union as can be enumerated in all the world besides, —not less than fifty or sixty.[1]

The latest apologist of denominationalism in the United States is Dr. Philip Schaff, in the *Princeton Review* of September, 1879. He dares to proclaim that "American denominationalism is the necessary outcome of the Church history of Europe,"—which might be honored with a conditional *transeat* if it were not blasphemously added: "It is overruled by providence for the more rapid spread of Christianity!" But with all its advantages, Dr. Schaff cannot but covertly envy the sublime unity of the Catholic Church, for he continues: "The Roman Church, with all its outward uniformity, has as much carnal animosity among its monastic orders as there ever existed between Protestant sects." Say you so, Dr. Philip Schaff? This sounds as if it might have been

[1] The existing sects that have made themselves any name are more properly divided into 40 greater and about 100 smaller. Buck's Theological Dictionary gives 116; Hitchcock's Religious Denominations some 120, many of which are found to have collapsed.

penned by some of the editors of the Jewish reptile press in Prussia,—and we are tempted to exclaim with the poet, "Jew, I thank thee for that word!" A three-hundred-sided Christianity must necessarily have as many faces as it has sides, and each side is bound to be obliquely if not diametrically opposed to every other. "As there *ever* existed between Protestant sects" is incredible in a doctor of theology and laws. What has become of the quarrels of, for example, Luther with Carlstadt and Hesshusius, both of whom he maltreated and banished; Calvin's burning of Servetus, indorsed by the gentle Melancthon;[1] Henry VIIIth's butcheries of Catholics for denying the supremacy and of Protestants for heresy![2] No one need fear the stirring up of bigotry by these and other examples. The cause of the first Reformers on the score of bloody persecutions has been given up by all earnest and honest non-Catholic writers. The corypheuses hunted down one another pitilessly. But where do we find recorded that the Augustinians, from whose ranks Luther seceded, ever banished or burnt the Dominicans, whom they envied the preaching of the indulgences? Who has handed down that the strong and subtle Jesuits —some 13,000 or 14,000 in number when suppressed—ever ripped up members of the other "monastic orders" to obtain the front ranks they acquired in fighting and conquering the rising isms? But one would scarcely need to go back beyond colonial times in the United States to find abundant examples of how the "brethren dwelt together in unity" and exercised no "carnal animosity" against one another. In Boston alone, in 1635, Roger Williams, founder of the Baptists, Rev. John Wheelwright, Ann Hutchinson (afterwards murdered on Long Island), and Aspinwall, were banished for heresy; in 1650 Sharp was lashed for having embraced the new sect of the Baptists, and in 1659 three persons were hanged as Quakers,—not to speak of the long and bloody wars waged against both Baptists and Quakers as "denominational"

---

[1] Calvin, Ep., 187. The Genevan is not generally credited with the imprisonment, banishment and death of also Valentine Gentilis, Jerome Bolsec, Favre, Perrin, Judge Peter Ameaux, Henri de la Marc, and lastly poor Jacques Gruet, who was beheaded and had his head nailed to a post for accusing Calvin of persecution and for proofs of impiety found in his writings. In Nuremburg, 1577–1617, 350 were executed for sorcery and heresy; 345 getting off with simple mutilation. Many of these were non-Catholic.

[2] Marcus Willson's Outlines, p. 338. Dr. Heylon (Baker's Chronicles) credits Henry VIII. in 38 years—to 1547—with the execution of 2 queens, 1 cardinal, 2 archbishops, 18 bishops, 13 abbots, 500 monks, 64 noblemen, 124 citizens, and 110 females. S. H. Burke, Men and Women of the Reformation, New York, 1872, makes his victims reach the enormous number of 80,000! of whom a large proportion were Protestants.

dissenters, as Bancroft relates after contemporary colonial historians. All which—and much more that might be adduced—proves that the older divisions into separate sects were not exactly a parting in peace like that of Paul and Barnabas (Acts xv.), but were accompanied by mutual bloody persecutions and vituperations, the latter not yet having died out on the lips of the doctor of theology of Union Theological Seminary, as witness his giving place in statistics by name to only twenty-three or twenty-four sects out of over fifty, and his insulting references to many minor sects, which have precisely the same reason of being and right of rebellion as the larger ones had, viz., the reason and right of private interpretation.

Dr. Roswell Hitchcock's *Dictionary of Religious Denominations*[1] (article "Protestants") lumps the Protestants in the United States at 25,000,000, but his own figures, in detail, foot up but little above 8,000,000.

Dr. Philip Schaff's series of three tables, respectively: 1, of 1870; 2, comparative, of 1776 (or 1780–90) and 1876; 3, of 1878 inclusive, besides being self-contradictory, differ *toto cælo*, even *cæteris paribus*, from the figures of Dr. Hitchcock's book, though the same Dr. Schaff has a long and eulogizing recommendation of Hitchcock's work inserted among the nearly five hundred approbations appended to the *Complete Analysis*.

Here are specimens of Dr. Schaff's tables: 2, of 1876; and, 3, of 1878, both taken, in his own words, "from official records and . . . leading men of different churches:"

STATISTICS OF 1876.			STATISTICS OF 1878.		
	Ministers	Churches		Ministers	Cong's.
Baptists, ...	13,779	22,924	All Baptists, ...	20,292	13,230
Methodists, ...	20,458	10,000	All Methodists, ...	23,568	32,000
Presbyterians, Gen. Assembly,	4,744	5,077	Presbyterians, Gen. Assembly,	6,012	7,147

Who is so simple as to believe that the Baptists gained 6513 ministers in two years, and that with only nine theological seminaries among the regular Baptists, and no talk yet of the easily multiplied "local preachers?" Still more incredible that they should have erected nearly 8000 churches, or organized 4000

[1] Published in 1875, in Complete Analysis of the Bible, with the public and detailed indorsements (*in fine*) of upwards of 300 Protestant ministers, bishops, doctors, and professors of every denomination, of any numbers, and eulogized by 175 secular and religious editors of papers, this *elenchus* must be considered as of undoubted authority by all the leading denominations of non-Catholics to date of publication.

congregations, *each year* for two years in succession, even if it be granted that the congregations exceed the churches.

But here is a harder nut to crack for a statistician. The Methodists had, in 1876, 8000 *more* churches than they had congregations in 1878, or they must have lost 4000 churches or congregations *per year* for two years in succession! Whither? And we are not yet at the bottom, for it appears from the writer's note at the foot of third table that, by the authority of the *Methodist Almanac*, 1879, the number of congregations "differs somewhat,"—some nearly 4000—from the figures in Dr. Schaff's columns. The table credits the Methodist Episcopal Church *North* with round 20,000 congregations, while the *Almanac* puts those of the Methodist Episcopal Church, without distinction,—South, East, and West, then, as well as *North*,—at 16,099. So about 12,000 congregations have vanished in two years! The compass will need to be boxed better to suit business Americans.

But we hasten to apologize. What has been lost in churches and congregations can readily be more than counterbalanced by an effective "local" Methodist clergy; for, pursues the same note, undisturbed by slight differences, "there are counted besides (ministers given above) 12,749 local preachers." In fact, if you want to go into exact details and count the whole force, "all the Methodist organizations together number 30 bishops and 26,642 local preachers, in addition to the regular ordained clergymen;" in fine, 18 bishops and nearly 3000 preachers more than the whole number given in the "official records" and by "leading men of different churches." Who goes bail for the paradox, that there is a "minister" *or* "local preacher" to every 68 Methodist "communicants," or a "minister" *and* a "local preacher" to every 136 "communicants?" And in this whole matter of "local preachers," as easily manufactured as a yard of jeans, we would recommend to Dr. Philip Schaff words, which we would be stoned to death for as blasphemers, from Dr. Walton's preface to his *Polyglot* (London, 1657): . . . "All are doctors; all are divinely learned; there is not so much as the meanest fanatic, or jack-pudding, who does not give his own dreams for the word of God. . . . These have filled our cities, villages, camps, houses, nay, *our churches and pulpits*, too, and lead the poor deluded people with them to ——." We spare this last, because we honestly believe that the old English doctor's conclusion is rather too sweeping for our country.

We come to compare the membership of the non-Catholic denominations by communicants and nominal members, meaning by the latter term those who can in any sense be claimed or are claimed as belonging to a particular sect. For contrast we will

also adduce, as examples, a few figures from Dr. Roswell Hitchcock's enumeration:

Ecclesiastical Statistics of 1878. (Dr. Schaff in Princeton Review, September, 1879.)			Dictionary of Religious Denominations. (Dr. Hitchcock's Complete Analysis, 1875.)	
DENOMINATION.	Commun. Members.	Nom. Members.	Members in United States.	Members in the World.
Baptists, ...	2,656,221		1,094,806	c 2,500,000
Episcopalians, . . .	314,367	1,250,000	1,100,000	
Quakers, ...	70,000	100,000		
Lutherans, ...	808,428	2,000,000	332,155	
Methodists, ...	3,428,050	14,000,000	2,240,000	c 3,000,000
Moravians, ...	9,407	16,236		
Presbyterians, . . .	897,598		c 445,378	c 57,846
Ref. Episcopalians, .	7,000	16,500		
Ref. Dutch, ...	79,000	251,000		
Ref. Germans, . . .	124,596	151,651		
Swedenborgians, . .	5,000	15,000		
Universalists, . . .	37,965	42,500		

Numbers marked *c* denote communicants.

1. If the blanks in the table of the *Princeton Review* were filled up according to the proportion between the communicant and nominal membership of the more numerous sects, the whole number of members of the *twenty-three* or *twenty-four* denominations *named* in this *full* list of Protestants would exceed 34,000,000! Take only half this number for the, certainly, twenty odd sects, *not named* here, and we would have within 10,000,000 of the number, which Doctor and Bishop Hopkins,[1] of Vermont, gave, twenty-five years ago, as the aggregate of Protestants in the whole world, viz., 61,000,000, or 51,000,000 Protestants in the Union. If this be *reductio ad absurdum*, whose is the absurdity? The blanks of the nominal, supplied from the communicant column, would raise the nominal members to over 21,000,000 for little better than half the "denominations" in the country, the communicants alone footing up nearly 9,000,000.

2. To show how arbitrary must be the relation as given between communicants and nominal members, the proportion of the former to the latter is among the Episcopalians as 1 to $4\frac{1}{6}$; Quakers, as 1 to $1\frac{3}{10}$; Lutherans, as 1 to $2\frac{1}{2}$; Methodists, as 1 to $4\frac{1}{2}$, Reformed Episcopalians, as 1 to $2\frac{1}{3}$; Reformed Germans, as 1 to $1\frac{1}{5}$; Swedenborgians, as 1 to 3; Universalists, as 1 to $1\frac{1}{7}$. Average proportion, as 1 to about $2\frac{1}{2}$.

The 9,000,000 communicants would thus average 22,500,000 nominal members for only the majority of the sects. We are evidently getting into the "long" of American Protestantisms; but the "short" will not delay its appearance.

3. The nominal membership of "all the Baptists" in the *Review*

[1] End of Controversy Controverted, Letter 22.

table of 1878, multiplied according to the proportion given for the more numerous sects, would produce 10,624,884 nominal Baptists in the United States. According to Hitchcock's *Dictionary*, published in 1875, the Baptists numbered in all "1,094,806 members" in these States, which, subtracted from Dr. Schaff's figures in 1878, would show an increase in a few years, and a difference of the insignificant sum of 9,530,078.

By the same inverse ratio and double back-action integral calculus, Dr. Schaff contrives to figure out 428,050 more Methodist communicants in the United States in 1878 than Dr. Hitchcock's best efforts, assisted doubtless by the same Dr. Schaff and the near five hundred indorsers of the *Complete Analysis*, could scrape together in the whole world in 1875,[1] and we are not oblivious of the fact stated in the *Review* that the "Baptists and Methodists, who are scarcely known in some countries of the Continent, and barely tolerated in others, are numerically the largest in the United States."[2]

By further comparison we find the Presbyterians credited with an increase of 450,000 communicants, or 1,800,000 nominal members, and the Lutherans with an accretion of 476,273, or 1,900,000, respectively, in four or five years.

And if the figures of Hitchcock represent total membership, as they do on their face, their glaring and monstrous disproportion with similar figures of Schaff can only be characterized as a thumping statistical lie.

As some extenuation for the honor of our common humanity, we will not fail to observe that the statistics or estimates of Dr. Hitchcock are not always of 1875, or even 1870, but sometimes reach back as far as 1869 and 1867, and in odd cases 1864, though the book printed in 1875 is supposed to represent the census nearest that date.

It will interest to contrast with both Dr. Hitchcock and Dr. Schaff these statistics of 1868, "taken entirely from Protestant sources, and chiefly from official documents published by the respective denominations,"[3] with the average annual increase.

---

[1] We, however, have taken Dr. Hitchcock's first number as somewhat nearer the truth.

[2] Princeton Review, September, 1879, p. 230.

[3] Catholic World, May, 1871, where are given exact details of fifty-one sects.

	Church Members in 1867.	Average Annual Increase in 25 years.
1. Lutherans,	332,155	7,182
2. German Reformed,	110,408	3,431
3. United Brethren,	97,983	1,319
4. Moravians,	6,655	26
5. Dutch Reformed,	57,846	1,261
6. Mennonites,	39,110	380
7. Reformed Mennonites,	11,000	200
8. Evangelical Association,	58,002	1,791
9. Christian Connection,	500,000	7,954
10. Church of God,	32,000	960
11. Old School Presbyterians,	246,350	8,958
12. New School Presbyterians,	161,538	2,167
13. Reformed Presbyterians (General Synod),	8,324	153
14. Synod of Reformed Presbyterians,	6,000	
15. Associate and United Presbyterians,	63,489	1,000
16. Associate Reformed Presbyterians,	3,909	80
17. Free Presbyterians,	1,000	
18. Cumberland Presbyterians,	100,000	1,819
19. Baptists,	1,094,806	13,796
20. Free Will Baptists,	59,111	204
21. Seventh-Day Baptists,	7,038	41
22. Dunkers,	20,000	500
23. German Seventh Day Baptists,	1,800	30
24. Free Communion Baptists,	104	
25. Anti-Mission Baptists,	105,000	6,143
26. Six-Principle Baptists,	3,000	
27. River Brethren,	7,000	80
28. Disciples (Campbellites),	300,000	4,762
29. Congregationalists,	278,362	4,734
30. Unitarians,	30,000	300
31. Universalists,	80,000	1,000
32. Protestant Episcopal,	194,692	6,536
33. Methodist Episcopal,	1,146,081	30,377
34. Methodist Protestant,	50,000	
35. Methodist Church,	50,000	2,000
36. Free Wesleyan,	25,000	200
37. African Methodist,	200,000	7,500
38. Zion African Methodist,	60,000	2,008
39. Methodist Episcopal (South),	585,040	4,087
40. Free Methodist,	4,889	617
41. West Primitive Methodists,	2,000	40
42. Independent Methodists,	800	
43. Friends, or Quakers,	100,000	1,000
44. Hicksites,	40,000	400
45. Shakers,	4,713	60
46. Adventists,	30,000	1,500
47. Swedenborgians,	5,000	186
48. Spiritualism,	165,000	8,000
49. Mormon Church,	60,000	2,000
50. Christian Perfectionists,	255	10
51. Catholic Apostolic Church,	250	10
Total,	6,396,110	134,802

At which officially stated rate of increase of fifty-one denominations in these States, there might have been, all counted, in 1878, 7,744,130, and by A. D. 1900 the whole number of professing Protestants in this progressive country may possibly reach 10,844,576, or, if the population increase at its usual ratio, some 50,000,000 *less* than all the prospective inhabitants of the republic. So far from being, or being likely to become, a Protestant nation is our

magnificent fatherland, that neither now is there, nor in the near future is there an even probable prospect of there being more than about a sixth of its citizens attached to any or all of the Protestant denominations.

Come we now in passing to sift Dr. Philip Schaff's "figures," supposed to represent the "facts" regarding the Catholic Church in the United States in 1878 inclusive. Three out of the six columns are inaccurate and misleading, misrepresenting even Sadlier's *Directory* of 1879. Instead of 52 bishops in 1878, as Schaff puts it, there were 63, 11 of whom are archbishops, of which archbishops one is a cardinal. Though the footnote remarks in *nonpareil* type, "the membership includes the whole Roman Catholic population," the same number is inscribed in both columns of "communicants" and "nominal membership." A comparison of Schaff and Sadlier with what may be called an authoritative pamphlet, viz., *The Catholic Church in the United States: its Rise, Relations with the Republic, Growth, and Future Prospects*,[1] will illustrate both Dr. Schaff's bungling misconceptions and Sadlier's inaccuracies.[2]

ROMAN CATHOLIC STATISTICS IN THE UNITED STATES FOR 1878.

	"Princeton Review."	"Sadlier's Directory."	"The Cath. Ch. in the United States."
Archbishops,	12	12	11
Bishops,	40	52	57
Ministers,	5,750	5,750	5,650
Congregations,	5,589	5,589	7,520[3]
Nominal Membership,	6,375,630	6,375,630	7,000,000
Communicant Membership,	6,375,630	Not given.	Not given.
Colleges,	78	78	77
Theological Seminaries,	23	23	33[4]

[1] By Very Rev. J. T. Hecker, editor of the Catholic World. Catholic Publication Society Company, 1879.

[2] Sadlier's Directory, Almanac, and Ordo, though the only publication of its kind in these States, is only official in as far as some reports it gives are sometimes indorsed by the authority of particular bishops of the dioceses over which they preside. As a whole it is not official, nor indorsed by any ostensible ecclesiastical authorization. A close observer will have remarked that its "Summary" is not accurately representative of even its own detailed data. "Recapitulations" are not unfrequently at war with items they are supposed to gather into one, and the same "Reports" are often continued from year to year without change.

[3] This includes 1800 chapels and stations, which are counted in the sense intimated by Dr. Schaff in note 6 to 3, Ecclesiastical Census, 1878. If this inclusion be considered unfair, we would like to know by what right the log-huts and box-houses, erected by the people and at public expense, to be used as public or district common schoolhouses, are Sunday after Sunday occupied as country "meeting-houses," and doubtless counted as among the denominational houses of worship. They certainly are almost invariably so used in Kentucky, and we have good reason to believe in the neighboring and Western States.

[4] These as "Ecclesiastical Institutions," doubtless, include religious houses of study.

In the little measure of justice that is done Catholics in these and similar tables dispersed throughout Dr. Schaff's long article, we ought to be grateful for the notification of some "facts" brought out by the figures of this table (3), to wit: 1. Catholics are credited with over twice and a half as many colleges as the "denomination" having the highest number among the sects, three times as many as the next highest, and quite as many as all the remaining sects put together.

2. The Catholic Church is shown as maintaining more theological seminaries than ten other "denominations," twice and a half as many as the regular Baptists, seven more than the Episcopalians, eight more than the Lutherans, within one of twice as many as "all the Methodists;" and if we were credited with our real number, twice as many as any single sect in the fifty odd denominations.

It is time to say a word about the diversity of computation of their own numbers, especially among prominent Catholics.

1. No reasonable man is going to make Catholics responsible for the reckless assertions, even accompanied by figures, of "national" and secret-society demagogues pretending to be Catholics. One, for example, has given data, place, and details, by which he wished, nine or ten years ago, to prove there were then over twelve millions of Catholics in the United States. Another—not, however, to be classed among scandalous nominal Catholics—by giving an average of 2500 people to each priest made the Catholics, in 1871, exceed 10,000,000.

2. The immense waves of immigration, sweeping millions on our shores in less than a score of years, have necessarily staggered even sober minds in making estimates. But, right here, let us say that, though it be conceded that the majority of our people are of Irish descent, there are not over 2,000,000 of our vast number who are actually of Irish birth.[1]

A great many more are of Celtic origin, and perhaps only the respectable minority of Anglo-Saxon lineage; but the Anglo-Saxon element does not exceed a fifth, or at most a fourth, of the whole population, much as we are vaunted by Dr. Schaff and toadyists as "the daughter of Great Britain," and "one of the two great branches of the Anglo-Saxon race."

The great God made us a nation; we owe little to Great Britain. And if men had anything to do with our race we Americans have made ourselves by electrifying into a homogeneous mass elements from every strong race. "But God made us, not we ourselves."

[1] Take any State: In Georgia, 5000 of Irish birth to 26,000 Catholics; in Indiana, 29,000 to 150,000; in Illinois, 120,000 to 400,000; in Louisiana, 17,000 to 200,000. Even in New York State, where there are 530,000 Irish by nativity, there are 1,125,000 Catholics. In Pennsylvania, finally, 285,000 to 560,000.

3. The great majority of well-informed, leading Catholics, and public writers of any particular note, have settled on about the figures of the pamphlet above as an average estimate, viz., 7,000,000 Catholics. The very detailed census ordered by our Holy Father, Leo XIII., in the course of 1879, if strictly taken, will give official figures as to our undoubted strength in the United States.

Now laying aside individual criticisms, what is the intention and animus of the whole tribe of the trumpeters of Protestant "Progress of Christianity in the United States?" In view of the too successfully attended lectures of a shallow but fluent atheist in the course of the past two years, and the ever-increasing publication of downright infidel literature, it has become painfully apparent how many hundreds of thousands, nay, millions, of our population openly sympathize with naked unbelief, who would scarcely stop short of offering incense literally to the Goddess of Liberty we have set forth on our coins, and are about to inaugurate in the harbor of New York as the tutelary genius of our nation. God forefend! But it is evil omen enough that the gigantic Goddess is but the emblem of the pagan deity "Libertas," and the representative of the live strumpet whom the fathers of the present French donors actually enthroned on the altars of desecrated Notre Dame in Paris, and worshipped but ninety years ago.

Catholics are not surprised at the workings of a leaven kneaded into the body politic in the last forty years by the increase of Protestant churches, and the decrease of faith among American Protestants. What need to corroborate this testimony of a late (January, 1881) New York correspondent of the London *Post:* "Indifferentism exists among Americans to a far greater extent than is generally supposed. The men who have fallen into this mode of thought have generally been educated Protestants, but their Church has wholly lost its hold upon them, and they have drifted away into what is not exactly infidelity, but which practically comes very near it." Protestants have been the dupes of their purblind leaders, and through their honesty and earnestness of purpose have become simple enough to hug the delusion that things were going on not only well enough, but gloriously; in fact, that they were making rapid strides in converting the country, and establishing a great Protestant nation in this grand New World. The few shades outlined here and there in the imaginative picture they would paint, are only admitted to set off the *couleur de rose* they would fain make us believe is the predominant feature of the grand reality portrayed. Here is about a common estimate: There are some 35,000,000 or 40,000,000 now of "more orthodox," respectable Protestants; two or three millions belonging to a "few petrified

sects, . . . having no right to exist except as antiquarian curiosity shops;" in fact, "a few obscure sects perpetuating their ignorance and stagnation, . . . dead to the surrounding world," which "cares no more for them than for antediluvian fossils."[1] And we have, say, 42,000,000 or 43,000,000 Protestants!

The Catholics may be possibly a fifth or sixth of this number, some over 6,000,000, though, of course, they count as little or nothing in the work of Christianity proper in the country. Throw in 7000 or 8000 Jews, count some 160,000 Indians (80,000 already converted as Protestants!), 135,000 Chinese, a million "miscellaneous," and we have about completed the 50,000,000 inhabitants of "America." "By which, of course, I mean here the United States," which, in fine, "with the other great branch of the Anglo-Saxon race, ... is chiefly intrusted by providence with the propagation of Bible Christianity to the end of the earth," . . . . especially "in the outlying semi-heathenish population."[2] Scarcely an indication of a hint that there are even a few thousands who—outside of the exceptions above—do not profess Christianity in one form or other. This is again the "long" of American Protestantism. What is the "short" of it and the truth? Fully one-half of this leading nation of the Western Hemisphere profess no religion whatever, though we hasten to add that these twenty odd millions of quasi-infidels are not actual unbelievers in the sense understood in Europe, and are often more amenable to Christian principles and have more human kindliness than many professing certain "denominations."

The professing Protestants in the country we have proved to be about equal or little superior in number to the Catholic population, though many call themselves Protestants because they are not Catholics, and as many more—minors and irresponsible persons—are under distinctively Protestant influence by blood or marriage relationship with "professors of religion."

Outside testimony concords with domestic confessions. Professor Flint, of Edinburgh, only the other day, blaming the American Presbyterians for being "slow and unenergetic," for "caring little for converts," "being too lazy to heal their own divisions," concluded that "the spirit of liberty was a disintegrating influence in a religious sense," adding significantly "that *all* the Protestant bodies (of the United States) were suffering from this severely," and "the only Church that seemed to thrive was the Catholic." Bishop Littlejohn, preaching before the University of Cambridge, declared in a scholarly period that our republicanism was undermining the faith of the American branch of the Anglicans. Commenting on

[1] Dr. Schaff's charitable estimate of the smaller sects, pages 231, 232.

[2] Dr. Schaff's Progress of Christianity in the United States, pp. 231, 235.

which the New York *Times* roundly pronounced that "not only had the influence of the democratic idea hindered for many years the Anglican Church in this country, but the same influence *is steadily disintegrating* the Protestant sects." . . . . "The drift of the times," it concludes, "is towards religious anarchy."

Outward show still remains a whited sepulchre. In vain to point to the 70,000 congregations, 60,000 edifices, 20,000,000 sittings, $300,000,000 worth of property. The more the churches the less the Christians. Protestantism is dividing its forces more here than elsewhere. Division is death. All these paraphernalia are but expensive preparations for a funeral. The ripples of the circle, caused by plunging the heavy stone of Protestantism into the, then, calm sea of the world, are ever widening, even weakening, until at last, and at no very distant time, they must fade out of sight on the ocean of humanity. Original Lutheranism, Calvinism, and Anglicanism are dead, while the London *Scientific Miscellany* (in London *Tablet*, February 7th, 1880) quotes Catholicity as over 254,000,000 strong. Neither the Thirty-nine Articles, nor the Confession of Augsburg, nor the Five Points of Calvinism, could each count a round million of followers, true to the letter, true to the spirit of the first reformers. The children of Luther, of Calvin, and of Elizabeth were born with the stain of their parents' original sin; doomed to split into a hundred sects and disintegrate even unto final dissolution.

Mr. W. H. Mallock joins James Anthony Froude in declaring that "the non-Catholic portion of Christendom has fought almost its last fight with Satan, and is about to surrender itself to his undisputed sway."[1] But what, they ask, "is the Catholic portion of Christendom" doing? "The Catholic Church is gaining ground in the more energetic races that had been the stronghold of Protestantism. Her numbers increase, her organization gathers vigor. Her clergy are bold, energetic, and aggressive. . . . . She has taken into her service her old enemy (?) the press, and has established a literature. Her hierarchy in England and America ('the two great branches,' we may remark, 'of the Anglo-Saxon race') have already compelled the state to consult their opinions and respect their pleasure." . . . . Query, by the same authority: "Why is Protestantism standing still while Rome is advancing? Why does Rome count her converts from among the evangelicals by tens, while she loses to them, but here and there, an exceptional and unimportant unit?"[2] One needs no answer but the text of Scripture: "By their fruits ye shall know them."

"Travellers assure us," concludes for us the Ritualistic organ,

[1] Short Studies on Great Subjects, by James A. Froude.

[2] Revival of Romanism, by the same.

St. Luke, "that the only form of religion that is making any way in the United States, keeping at the same time within the bounds of decency and decorum, is the Catholic."

Catholic increase in the United States in the first half of the past century has been from $\frac{1}{120}$th part of the population to $\frac{1}{20}$th; in the second half from $\frac{1}{20}$th to $\frac{1}{7}$th. Since 1870 Protestantism has averaged yearly in the city of Rome 10 converts.

In the electric light irradiating from the simple eloquence of this contrast there needs no horoscope to predict that it will not require many more decades to run their course in this age of quick mutations before America, if she shakes off the skeptic torpor benumbing her vitality, shall have made her final choice between linking her eternal destinies with the crumbling ruins of the isms or taken her stand on the Rock of Peter and in the everlasting Church that is built thereon. There is no abiding ism between Jericho and Jerusalem. When Protestant isms shall have exhausted themselves, like their predecessors, the men-made counterfeits of the buried centuries, their false lights going out as an extinguished comet which has surprised and astounded nations, the unbiased American mind will direct its acumen to observe more narrowly the brilliancy of the colossal figure uprisen in the land, who, as she conquered of old the Greek, the Roman, and the barbarian, is even yet "bringing into activity every intellect to the obedience of Christ." II. Cor. x. 5.

GALILEO GALILEI AND THE COPERNICAN SYSTEM.

"*E pure si muove; For all that the Earth does move.*"

WILL the question of Galileo and the Roman Inquisition never die out? Forty years ago it seemed utterly exhausted. The mass of myths which commenced to spring up, about a hundred years after his interment, and had grown feraciously around his name, was being uprooted. Polemical bitterness and the readiness of infidelity to throw discredit on Christianity had combined to force the growth. But the careful and more candid investigation of distinguished scholars, Catholics and Protestants, had succeeded in throwing a flood of light on the life and deeds of the Italian philosopher, and under the bright rays of truthful history, myths and falsehoods, having no roots in the truth, seemed rapidly dying out. To say nothing of Italian and French writers, Ranke and others in Germany, Hallam Brewster, the *Edinburgh Review*, and others in England, had studied with more or less impartiality and intelligence all the documents then accessible bearing on the subject, and had made it clear that the currently accepted ideas of cruel and long imprisonment, of tortures, and of narrow escape from death, were but shadowy phantoms of imaginations excited by *odium theologicum*, and had no solid foundation in fact.

But popular errors die hard. Notwithstanding all these researches and their manifest results, the old story held and holds its own in many minds with wonderful tenacity. Many still imagine to themselves a Galileo lying chained for one or for three, or for five years, in a dark, loathsome, underground dungeon until he loses his sight; or else stretched on a rack in cruel tortures, while scowling, hard-hearted inquisitors stand around and gloat over his sufferings; or else they see him attired only as the American revisors of the New Testament wished to clothe St. Peter,[1] and kneeling as he reads his abjuration; and then rising and stamping the floor with suppressed indignation and muttering to himself, *e pure si muove; for all that, the Earth does move.* John Quincy Adams, ex-President of the United States, rehearsed it with emphasis, in 1843, in his oration before the Cincinnati Astronomical Society, on the occasion of laying the corner-stone of their observatory. About twenty-five years afterwards, Jefferson Davis, ex-President of the Confederate States, introduced the phrase attributed to Galileo as

[1] "So when Simon Peter heard that it was the Lord, he girt his coat about him (for he was naked) and cast himself into the sea."—St. John xxi. 7.—*Revised Version.* Proposed emendation by American commentators, "*had on his under garment only.*"

a striking illustration in an address delivered by him in Alabama. J. W. Draper refers to it again and again in his work on the *Conflict between Science and Religion*, published as the twelfth number of the International Scientific Series. Evidently the myth has still possession. It stalks through our ordinary field of literature as if privileged and not to be questioned, and presents itself whenever a point is to be made by Protestantism against the Church, or by infidelity against revealed religion.

Although the fact has passed almost unnoticed in England, and we believe entirely so in this country, there has been of late years a vast and a very important increase of *Galilean* literature on the Continent of Europe. The complete works of Galileo were published in Florence (1842–1856) in sixteen volumes, two of them containing all his known letters, and three others the letters of his friends and contemporaries to him. Biot, Arago, Bertrand, and a host of writers in France, Palmieri, Carruso, Wolinski, Pieralisi, and others in Italy, availed themselves of this treasure to investigate anew the events of Galileo's life and the scientific value of his achievements. In 1850, Monsignore Marini, custodian of the Vatican archives, published an essay, prepared for a Scientific academy, in which he gave an account of the original MS. record of the trial of Galileo, lately restored to the archives, and quoted long extracts from it bearing on the main points at issue in the trial. In 1867, *Henri de l'Epinois* published in the *Revue des Questions Historiques*, of Paris, a detailed account, page by page, of the manuscript, giving in full the important documents. In 1876, *Berti* published the entire manuscript in Rome, and two years later M. de l'Epinois republished it in full in Paris, correcting sundry mistakes and errors made by Berti in deciphering the aged and cramped handwriting. The presentation of this important original document could not fail to stimulate other researches. The diplomatic correspondence of Florence, of Venice, and of Naples for those years was carefully searched, and with success. Elsewhere other documents were found throwing side-lights on the subject. So thorough has been the scrutiny, that we even have what appear to be the very blank slips placed one before each judge of the tribunal in Galileo's case, bearing the erasures, interlineations, and changes made by each individual as they were apparently discussing the matter, and consulting together as to the precise wording of the sentence to be pronounced. It is hard to see what more we can now look for or desire in the nature of original documents in this case.

All these documents have been examined and re-examined in every light by the scholars of Italy, France, and Germany. A good-sized book-case might be filled with the many volumes,

pamphlets, and articles which have appeared on the subject within the last thirty years, especially since 1867.

The material is superabundant. Henceforth there can be no difficulty in ascertaining precisely what did take place, and in seeing that the long-current charges of cruelty and torture are utterly groundless. It is equally evident that the charge against the Church of opposition to the advancement of science is likewise without valid foundation. This latter charge is by far the more important one, to us at least, in this age. To enable the reader to view the whole question broadly and to weigh it justly, it may be well to commence by giving a summary of the life of Galileo Galilei himself.

He was born at Pisa, in Italy, February 15th, 1564, of a respectable but somewhat reduced Italian family, which is said to have changed, a few generations before, the original name of Bonajuti for that of Galilei. At an early age he entered the university of his native city, then one of the most flourishing institutions of learning in Italy, and devoted himself to a course of philosophy, with a view of entering on the medical profession, for which his father designed him. Here he soon manifested a disposition to test or verify the teachings of the schools—then entirely Aristotelian—by practical experiments, thus giving early indications of that trait of character which later on won for him the proud title of "Creator of Experimental Science." At the age of eighteen he chanced one day to notice with what regularity a large lamp in the cathedral, suspended by a cord from the lofty roof and hanging down before the main altar, swung to and fro, after having been accidentally moved by a workman. Examining the matter more carefully, he found that all the vibrations, great and small, so long as they were perceptible, occupied each the same exact length of time; and that all pendulums, vibrating freely, are controlled by the same law of isochronism. At once he devised a mode by which physicians might avail themselves of this principle, to time with accuracy the beatings of the human pulse. Years afterwards he applied the same principle to the accurate measurement of time, by introducing a pendulum into the machinery of clocks.

At the conclusion of his course, instead of taking his degree as a physician, Galileo resolved to devote himself to mathematics, machinery, and physical sciences generally. The results soon proved the wisdom of his choice. He invented a hydrostatic balance. An able treatise from his pen, on the *Centre of Gravity of Bodies*, attracted universal attention. At the very early age of twenty-five, his rising reputation secured for him, through the recommendation of Cardinal Del Monte, a chair of mathematics in the University of Pisa, which he filled for four years. In his lectures,

often based in part on his own experiments, and sometimes illustrated by them, he not only went far beyond the previous teachings of the schools, but on more than one point he rejected as false what had hitherto been received and maintained by the peripatetic followers of Aristotle, almost as axioms not to be questioned. Hence arose disputes, oftentimes personal and bitter. Both parties were intemperate in language, and Galileo was a master of ridicule and galling sarcasm. One of those contests has its niche in history. The Aristotelians taught that, since bodies fall because of their weight, a heavy body must naturally fall faster than a light one. Galileo, on the contrary, taught that, of themselves, both would fall with equal rapidity, and that any actual difference observed must be attributed, not to the difference of weight, but to the unequal resistance of the air, which impedes the fall of one more than it does that of the other. After much angry discussion it was resolved to test the matter by a public experiment. For the question was one which the public could readily understand, and which all took an interest in. Two spherical balls of lead were accordingly prepared; one very heavy, the other quite small and comparatively light. They were both dropped at the same instant from the top of the Leaning Tower of Pisa, one hundred and seventy-eight feet high, in the presence of the magnates of the city, the professors and students of the university, and of a vast crowd of citizens. All had taken sides either with the brilliant young professor or with his more conservative opponents. All watched anxiously the result of the experiment. Side by side the two balls fell downwards, as all eyes saw, and reached the earth at the very same instant. Galileo was triumphant; his opponents chagrined and mortified, but still unwilling to accept their defeat. The bitterness of the conflict became so intense that, in 1592, Galileo was forced to leave Pisa. He withdrew to Padua, where, for eighteen years, he was professor of mathematics in the University of that city. Here likewise the contests between him and the Aristotelians continued, but with less of personal bitterness than at Pisa. During his stay in Padua, he invented a species of thermometer and several other instruments, of which by far the most important was the telescope. Hearing accounts of the wonderful clearness with which Metius, a physicist of Holland, had been able to examine distant objects by combining several lenses of glass having curved faces, he quickly constructed a rude telescope to view heavenly bodies. It magnified only three diameters. But it verified the principle. He soon constructed a larger one, magnifying eight diameters, which he presented to the Republic of Venice, and afterwards a third one, having a magnifying power of thirty-three diameters. Through the use of this he was able in time to announce several astonishing and important astronomical discoveries. He saw

clearly, and confirmed the existence of solar spots, already discovered and announced by the Jesuit astronomer, Scheiner, but ridiculed by many. He saw also mountains in the moon, the changing moon-like appearances of the planets, Venus and Mercury, confirming the assertion of Copernicus a century before, who said those planets must really have such phases, although in his time invisible to the eye. Galileo discovered also the four satellites of Jupiter, which he called the *Medicean stars*, in honor of the Grand Duke of Tuscany.

The renown of those discoveries filled all Italy, and in 1610 the Grand Duke recalled Galileo from Padua. He was again named professor of mathematics in Pisa, but without the obligation of residence or of giving lectures. He accordingly fixed his residence henceforth in Florence, near his patron. Here the old quarrel was renewed or continued with a bitterness more intense than ever. If the brilliant discoveries of Galileo had given him a giant strength in public estimation, his adversaries, on the other hand, now found a point in his teaching on which they thought they could surely triumph. As far back probably as 1595 he had embraced what was then usually called the Pythagorean, and is now known as the Copernican theory of the solar system. His astronomical discoveries now placed him in the very front rank among its upholders. This theory, we need scarcely say, holds that the sun is a relatively immovable body in the centre of the solar system, around which the earth and the other planets move in circular orbits, the earth making its circuit in one year. The earth, moreover, has another motion of its own. It revolves on itself around a central axis once in twenty-four hours. Subsequent astronomical researches have proved that the planetary orbits are elliptical, not circular; that the sun revolves on an axis of its own, and yields to the gravitation of the planets, and that the sun and the entire planetary system connected with it are all moving in space. But of these nicer points nothing was known in Galileo's time. He held the theory in its original simpler form. Proposed originally, so far is as known, by Pythagoras, founder of the philosophic school of Italy, more than five hundred years before Christ, and maintained by Aristarchus, of Samos, about 270 B.C., it had sunk into obscurity in presence of the more specious theories of other philosophers, developed by Ptolemy, who held that the earth was firm and immovable and the centre of the universe, and that the sun, the moon, and the planets, and all the stars, revolved around it once in twenty-four hours; all, save the stars, having various other motions of their own. The opinion of Pythagoras and Aristarchus was recalled with a smile, as a signal instance of the power of so-called philosophers to dream absurd dreams. In modern ages, this theory was revived and pro-

posed by Nicholas De Cusa, a noted professor of the fifteenth century, afterwards a cardinal at Rome. He proposes it in his work, *De docta Ignorantia*, made public in 1435, and printed at the expense and care of Cardinal Amboise immediately on the invention of the art of printing. A certain number of his disciples retained and handed down the teaching of their master. Copernicus, born at Thorn, in Prussia, in 1473, came in early life to Italy for his studies, and in 1500 was already professor of mathematics in the University of Rome. Such was his high repute that in 1512, even after he had returned home to be a canon of the Cathedral of Frauenberg, he was specially consulted from Rome in reference to the grand scientific work already projected, and to be the glory of that century,—the emendation of the *Julian Calendar*. In Italy, Copernicus, coming in intimate contact with the followers of Cardinal de Cusa, had embraced and taught the Pythagorean theory, and continued to advocate it after his return to Germany. In 1533, Widmanstadt—one of his pupils—came from Germany to Rome, and, like a knight-errant of science, publicly maintained it as a thesis, after the fashion of the day, in an oral discussion, in which all who wished to contradict him and to argue for the Ptolemean system, were welcome to take part. The discussion, at the instance of the Pope, was held in the Vatican Gardens, in the presence of Pope Clement VII. himself, who rewarded the young man by appointing him one of his own private secretaries. Celio Calcagnini, in 1518, had written a work, *Quod coelum stet, terra autem moveatur*, and been even more highly rewarded. In 1543, just before his death, Copernicus gave to the world his great work, *De Orbium Cœlestium Revolutionibus*. It was dedicated, by permission, to Pope Paul III., and the expenses of publication had been borne by Cardinal Schoneberg until he died, and after his death by Gisio, Bishop of Ermeland. This work, from the pen of so renowned and honored a scholar, published under such high patronge, could not but give a fresh and most powerful impulse to the theory which, gradually dropping the name of Pythagorean, has become known as emphatically the Copernican theory.

Galileo at Florence, exempt from the routine duties of a professorship, and not tied down to a graduated course of instruction, but free to take up any subject he pleased, threw himself heart and soul into the advocacy of this theory, which his late astronomical discovery of the varying crescent form of the planets Venus and Mercury seemed to confirm. He spoke with the fervor of an exile returning home triumphant over his adversaries. On their side the reclamations were angry and fierce. They based their opposition not alone on the opposition of the theory to the concordant testimony of the senses of all men, nor on its repug-

nance to the accepted teachings of philosophers for so many ages, especially of the master of them all, Aristotle, but also on the ground that this theory contradicts the very words of Holy Scripture in various passages. In this they took a leaf from the books of the Lutheran professors of Tubingen, who raised such a storm in that university against a young student of divinity, Kepler, who had devoted himself to mathematics and had embraced and was defending the Copernican system, that in order to save himself from ruin he had to pass to the Catholic University of Gratz, under the Jesuits, where, though a Protestant, he taught mathematics. A short while after, he met *Tycho Brahe*, another Protestant forced to flee to the Catholic portion of Germany to escape the assaults of his co-religionists for his astronomical heresies. They worked together until the aged astronomer of Uranienberg was laid in the tomb. Kepler continued his work until his own death at Catholic Ratisbon, in 1630. Wolfgang Menzel writes of Kepler: "The theologians of Tubingen condemned his discovery, because the Bible teaches that the sun revolves about the earth, and not the earth about the sun. Joshua commanded the sun to stand still. He was about to suppress his books when an asylum was opened to him at Gratz. The Jesuits, who knew better how to prize his scientific talent, retained him, although he openly avowed his Lutheranism. It was only at home that he suffered persecution, and it was with difficulty that he succeeded in saving his own mother from being burned alive for a witch."

It may here be observed that the University of Tubingen stood not alone in their mode of treating the question. Was it not an almost inevitable consequence of their teaching as to the verbal inspiration of the Scriptures. Hence, wherever among Protestants the theory of Copernicus was advanced, it was met on the part of the Zealots with the peremptory reply that it contradicted the Scripture and should at once be rejected. The names of Gilbert and of Bacon will answer for England.

In them, with their narrow-minded views of biblical inspiration and interpretation, such a course may seem somewhat natural and logical. But among Catholics, with wider and freer views on both, it cannot boast of that character. The passages of Lyell given further on, may serve as an illustration of our meaning. The scriptural argument was not introduced into the Galilean controversy in the spirit of the Church. It was used by his opponents as an available weapon against an enemy hated alike and feared, and whom they were determined to crush.

To whom the first introduction was due, whether to Galileo yearning for new and startling discoveries and hoped-for triumphs in the field of theology, or to the astuteness of his opponents, cannot now be determined. Anyhow it was a deplorable, uncatholic step.

By its introduction, the controversy assumed a new and threatening phase. It was judged proper to make some provision against danger. Accordingly Galileo deemed it advisable to go in person to Rome. This was his second visit to the eternal city. He had gone thither some twenty years before, ere the star of his reputation had risen. He reached Rome, on this second visit, in March, 1611. His own letters to his friends bear testimony to the great honors with which he was received by Cardinal Del Monte, by Prince Cesi, and "by everybody, especially by the Jesuit Fathers." He was greeted with applause wherever he appeared, listened to with interest and attention when he spoke, fêted by cardinals and nobles, and received more than graciously by the Holy Father, in various audiences. Finally Galileo returned to Florence, happy and triumphant.

But at Florence the storm would not be quelled. The controversy continued, and gradually came to centre exclusively on the scriptural argument. Galileo's friends advised him unceasingly to avoid the snare. A new interpretation or proposed explanation of scriptural texts, contrary to one hitherto universally accepted, could not be admitted, unless rendered absolutely necessary on most cogent grounds. He was a layman and an astronomer. Let him stick to his physical and astronomical arguments, and leave the discussion of the meaning of texts of Scripture to the theologians. This advice came to him from all sides, especially from his friends in Rome, from Cardinal Del Monte, Monsignor Dini, and others.

But Galileo had become too excited to heed advice, however prudent. Guicciardini comments on his perpetual and intemperate quarrelling, and foretells that trouble must come of it. His friends complained to each other that he looked on any remonstrance or counsel from them as an indication of their taking sides in some measure with his opponents. He spoke and wrote often very intemperately, adding fuel to the flame. At length a letter from him to Castelli, one of his disciples, written, as he says, hastily and *currente calamo*, came to the knowledge of his opponents in Florence, and was by them (February 5, 1615), presented to the tribunal of the Holy Office in Rome, as unorthodox and contrary to Scripture. They intended this to be the initial point of judicial proceedings in the matter.

Galileo's friends and well-wishers did not desert him. Cardinal Bellarmine assured Mgr. Dini that "the only point at issue, was to propose the theory as a theory, not as an indisputable fact. There was no intention of condemning the theory." And he wrote to Cardinal Del Monte, "Let Galileo stick to mathematics and physics, and abstain from putting forward new interpretations of Scrip-

ture, however ingenious; they are departures from the *consensus patrum*. And he wrote (April 12, 1615), to Forcarini, "You will act prudently (and Galileo, also), if you maintain this opinion as an hypothesis and not as an established truth. If you will treat of the Copernican system and of the proofs of it, without entering on Scripture . . . there will be no difficulty whatever."

But neither advice nor admonition even from so high a quarter availed aught. Galileo persisted in his own passionate course. Perhaps he had brought himself to believe that he could force the Tribunal at Rome to decide at once that his interpretations of the texts of Scripture were the true ones. In January, 1616, he came again to Rome, to urge the matter on. He wrote to a friend soon after his arrival, giving a gratified account of the honor with which as usual he had been received and welcomed. But by the end of the month he was again impatient, fretful, and even bitter, because of the evident delay or rather the unwillingness of the ecclesiastical tribunals to move in the matter, and he left no stone unturned to push them to some action. He called on the cardinals and on the officials concerned, bored them, and literally wearied them out by the persistent and importunate, and often most untimely appeals of himself, and of some equally hot-headed adherents to have the matter taken up. At length he succeeded. "If you will have it, let it be so." The question was taken up because Galileo forced it by his long-continued insistence and importunity. The Holy Office, following its usual course of procedure, first referred the matter to the *Qualificatores*, a subcommittee of several clergymen, not judges of the tribunal, but advisers. After examination, they reported that two propositions, constituting the Copernican theory, were deserving of condemnation.

I. The sun is the centre of the world and immovable. *Foolish and absurd in philosophy, and formally heretical, inasmuch as it contradicts directly the express declarations of the Scripture.*

II. The earth is not the centre of the world, and is not immovable. *Foolish and absurd in philosophy and erroneous in faith.*

In considering the judgment of this subcommittee, we may pass over, as of no importance, their philosophical condemnation of the propositions as being both of them *foolish* and *absurd*. But it is to be noted that the first proposition is declared *formally heretical*, the second one, only *erroneous in faith*. These are technical terms, having each its special value. To be *formally heretical* is the strongest term of condemnation that could be used, and the qualificators used it because they believed that the proposition did contradict expressly the words of Divine Scripture. Their opinion was wrong, because they did not understand—had not then the means of discovering—the real sense of those words to which they refer.

The second censure, *erroneous in faith*, is much milder. They apply it to a proposition, which only by a course of reasoning is brought into contradiction with what they believed to be the true sense of Scripture. It might fail, either because that process of reasoning was faulty, or because their interpretation of Scripture was not the true one. This explanation is necessary for the proper understanding of the report of the qualificators. But for the question before us it is superfluous. *The report was not acted on.* The Holy Office having received it, declined to pronounce sentence in accordance with its purport. On the contrary it was content to admonish Galileo, and to exact from him a personal promise in writing that for the future he would not, in any way, either in writing or in lectures, teach or maintain the incriminated opinion or the contrary. To abate the controversy, he was to observe a *silentium pacificum* on the matter. This promise he gave as required, in the hands of Cardinal Bellarmine on the 26th of February, 1616. Thereupon the whole matter was dropped by the Holy Office. Galileo remained three months longer in Rome, and after one, if not more than one, favorable audience of the Holy Father, Pius V., returned to Florence, bearing with him, or receiving soon after, a letter from Cardinal Bellarmine (26th May, 1616) attesting that Galileo "had not been tried and condemned, or sentenced, but that only a monition had been given him." During all his stay in Rome, every honor due to so great a philosopher had been shown to him.

The monition given to Galileo, on February 26th, 1616, properly closed his case then before the Holy Office. Another congregation of cardinals—that of the Index—had taken up the matter, and, on March 5th, published a general disciplinary rule and enactment, prohibiting henceforth books that upheld the Copernican theory as absolute truth, that theory being erroneous and contrary to the Holy Scripture, and also requiring that such books, already published, should be so amended as to present the theory in an hypothetical form, or mere theory, not as an established positive truth. However, as Galileo, although still present in Rome, was not before that tribunal in any way, and as none of his writings were enumerated by it, in the number of prohibited works, it is enough to say, here, that this evidently studied omission of them, when some mention of them would naturally be looked for, can only be regarded as an additional evidence of a desire on all sides to spare Galileo's feelings, and to avoid even the appearance of censuring him. It is also worthy of notice, that in this disciplinary Regulation, the Congregation of the Index was unwilling to use the term "formally heretical," proposed as we saw by the qualificators of the Holy Office, and, instead, characterizes the opinion of Copernicus by the milder judicial phrase, "erroneous and contrary to Scripture."

For fifteen years after this, Galileo continued his scientific labors and investigations at Florence, without any other trouble than an occasional, and to him, perhaps, now refreshing, minor battle with his old foes, the Peripaticians. During these years he seems to have repeatedly visited Rome, and to have been always received there with the honors due to his reputation. A visit which he made in 1624, seems to have been intended to meet and frustrate a suspected renewed attempt of his opponents to get him again into some trouble on account of a new work of his, *Il Saggiatore*. If the conjecture be true, his visit attained its purpose. The attempt against him, if really contemplated, fell through miserably. He was welcomed and honored even more than before, and he returned to Florence triumphant.

Having completed the MS. of a work, on which he had labored, as he tells us, off and on for seven or eight years, Galileo came to Rome in May, 1630, to obtain from the *Master of the Sacred Palace*, the proper official at Rome, an *Imprimatur*, or permission to publish it. It was entitled *A Dialogue on the two great Systems of the World*. One speaker upholds the olden Ptolemean system, a second upholds the Copernican system, and a third, *Simplicius*, comments on the arguments of both. The MS. was examined, sundry phrases were softened or changed in order that there might be no violation of the regulations of the Congregation of the Index, and other changes were still to be made, chiefly in the matter of the Preface, and of the conclusion. Before these could be effected, Galileo was suffering from the summer heats, and desired for the sake of his health to leave Rome for a time at least. The Master of the Sacred Palace, full of kindly regard and courtesy to Galileo, incautiously gave him the official *Imprimatur*, on the understanding, however, that the changes agreed on should be made, and that the work was to be printed, of course, in Rome, and therefore under his further inspection. But while Galileo was at Florence the plague broke out and rendered travelling dangerous. He did not return with the MS. to Rome. The official required the MS. at least to be sent to him. This Galileo did not do, alleging that the quarantine rendered it impossible. He asked, instead, that any further examination of the MS. be made by chosen parties at Florence, and that the book be printed in that city instead of Rome. After some correspondence, the Roman official yielded; and the book was printed in Florence in 1632. Its appearance was the signal for a new storm. Galileo was charged with a direct and flagrant violation of the Monition given to him sixteen years before, and, on investigation, it further appeared that he had concealed from the Roman official the very important fact in his case, that such a monition had been given. For this double offence, constituting,

as we would say, an aggravated case of contempt of court, Galileo was, on 1st October, 1632, officially summoned to Rome to account for his proceedings before the Holy Office.

His position was aggravated by a special circumstance. In the book, Simplicius, who speaks as judge commenting on the arguments of both, is made to utter many inept and ridiculous things, and the reader is forced to smile at least at the silly exhibitions of his ignorance and his utter lack of sound judgment. It was loudly asserted and believed by many, both in Florence and in Rome, that in this character Galileo intended, in some measure, to portray Pope Urban VIII. himself, who, though not an adherent of Copernicanism, had as Cardinal Barberini in 1616, and as Pope in 1624, shown him very great attention and very substantial kindness. The Pope, for a time at least, keenly felt the ridicule alleged to be cast on him. It is true that Galileo strenuously denied the charge. But his denial, unfortunately, did not weigh much with those who knew the man. Still, for ourselves, weak, and vain, and sarcastic as he was known to be, we cannot conceive him to have been so utterly void of heart as to repay with such ingratitude the honors, the friendship, and the pecuniary pensions he and his children were even then receiving from the Pope or through his influence.

Under the circumstances it is evident that Galileo, feeling himself without defence, was reluctant to come. He hoped time might allay the storm and soften embittered feelings. He pleaded for delay. His own health, the severity of the weather, the inconveniences of the quarantine which he must encounter on the trip, were all alleged as excuses for delay. He did not reach Rome until the 13th of February, 1633. His reception was at first, to his surprise, not much unlike those of previous visits. He was lodged as a guest in the palace of Nicolini, the Florentine ambassador, the Villa Medici, on the Pincian Hill, now the French Academy of Arts in Rome. His letters tell of the visits of welcome he received, even repeatedly, from officials of the Holy Office. Everything seemed to promise kindness to him personally. His treatment called forth expressions of admiration in the dispatches of Nicolini to his own court at Florence. At length, however, after two months of such sweet waiting, the trial came on. On the 12th of April, in obedience to a summons, Galileo appeared in the council hall of the Holy Office, before the officials of that tribunal, for what we may call a preliminary examination. He was asked if he were the author of the book entitled *Dialogo*, etc. He acknowledged the authorship of it. "All that it contains I recognize as composed by me." Being interrogated concerning his visit to Rome in 1616, he replied that he had come at that time of his own accord. Aware of the doubt then entertained concerning the

opinion of Copernicus, and desirous of holding only holy and correct opinions, he came to Rome for the purpose of being instructed on that point. Had any determination, they asked, been reached? Yes; the Congregation of the Index had decided that the Copernican theory, taken as an absolute fact, was contrary to Scripture, and therefore it could only be treated as an hypothesis. This had been notified to him by Cardinal Bellarmine. Had anything special in reference to himself personally been added? This interrogatory was clearly intended to bring out the Monition given him,—the gravest point in his case. His memory on this point was very much at fault. He did recollect a monition given him *viva voce*. He did not remember if others had been present at its delivery, nor that it was in writing, nor whether certain important phrases now mentioned were contained in it. He had relied entirely on the letter of Cardinal Bellarmine to him (dated the 26th of May, 1616). The other matters might well have passed from his memory after so many years. Considering that the tribunal had in its possession one of the two original copies of the Monition, signed by Galileo himself and attested by a notary, the assumed loss of his copy and this forgetfulness on his part, while it might seem strange and somewhat dubious, could easily be remedied. When further asked whether he had said anything of this Monition, when he applied to the Master of the Sacred Palace for an *imprimatur* for his work, he replied: "I said nothing at all of it to the reverend Master of the Sacred Palace. I did not think it necessary. In that work I neither held nor defended the opinion of the movement of the earth and of the immovability of the sun. Nay, in that work, I maintain the contrary opinion, and show that the arguments of Copernicus are invalid and inconclusive."

These closing words of the examination must, we opine, have made the examiners stare or smile.

Galileo was now before the tribunal, officially and in its custody. Instead of a prison, they "assigned to him an apartment in the palace itself of the Holy Office, in the quarters set aside for the use of the officials." Here he was attended by his own servant and by the servants of Nicolini, could receive visitors and correspond with his friends, and had a large Italian garden to take exercise in whenever he desired. Galileo himself, in a letter written from the palace to his friend Bocchineri, expatiates on the unusual comforts with which he is surrounded, the three rooms in the apartments of the Fiscal placed at his service, and of the personal attentions, in every respect, which he is receiving on all sides. Well might Bocchineri say: "I am sure Galileo was far more uncomfortable in the quarantine at Ponte-Centino than in the Holy Office."

On the 22d he had an attack of acute rheumatism in one leg.

The officials visited him repeatedly, strove to give him relief and to cheer him, and declared that, as soon as he was able to move with comfort, he must return to the Villa Medici. In the meantime everything possible should be done to alleviate his sufferings. In a week he was over it. But before going, Galileo himself requested to be allowed to meet the examiners again, for he wished to add something more to what he had already said. A meeting was accordingly appointed for the 30th of April. On that day, and before the same officials, he further stated that since the previous examination he had carefully re-read his work, a thing he had not done for three years previously. He now saw and freely acknowledged its errors. "It appears to me so written in several passages that a reader, not cognizant of my true interior conviction, might well suppose that the arguments adduced in favor of the erroneous side (Copernicanism), and which I aimed to confute, were proposed in such manner as by their force rather to produce conviction than to be easily refuted. Two of them especially, based on the solar spots and on the tides of the ocean, seem to be proposed with more force and in stronger terms than is becoming in one who holds them to be inconclusive and aims to refute them, as I interiorly and truly held and hold them to be inconclusive and susceptible of refutation. . . . If I had to write the same argumentation over again, I would certainly do it in such manner that they would not present a seeming show of force, of which essentially and truly they are destitute. It was an error on my part, I acknowledge it, an error of vanity and ambition, of pure ignorance and of inadvertence." After this voluntary statement, the tribunal was in the act of rising, when Galileo returned and added something more. "In further proof," he said, "that I have not held and do not hold the condemned and false opinion, if I am allowed, as I crave, opportunity and time to demonstrate it more clearly, I am ready to do it. And there is a fitting opportunity. For in the book itself, as published, the interlocutors agree to meet at some future time to discuss, one by one, several questions of natural philosophy belonging to the matters already discussed. Availing myself of this point to add one or two more days of dialogue between them, I promise to take up again the arguments produced in favor of the false and condemned opinion, and to refute them in the most convincing manner that God will give me strength to do. I ask the Holy Office to concur with me in this good purpose, by granting me an opportunity to put it into execution." Whether again the officials stared or smiled we cannot say. Of this we may be sure, they lost much of their esteem and respect for Galileo personally.

On the close of the meeting Galileo, as he had been assured, was transferred again to the Villa Medici, and committed to the

tender cares of Nicolini, the ambassador, and of his family, there to await any further proceedings in his case. He enjoyed his carriage drives around Rome. We find him at Castel Gandolfo, walking through the Alban groves, or reclining on the volcanic banks of the beautiful Alban lake. Once, on May 10th, he was summoned to the Holy Office. The charges against him, or, as we would say, the Indictment, that had been drawn up, was made known to him, and a space of eight days assigned to him to prepare his defence as to his violation of the Monition and the irregular publication of his book. He really had no defence. Instead of availing himself of that time, he preferred at once to present to them the original private letter of Cardinal Bellarmine, on which he had relied, and by which he claimed to have been guided; and he renewed the protestation of the sincerity and good faith with which he had acted. After this, he returned to the Villa Medici and continued to wait. There was evidently a quiet influence working in his favor. Some thought the whole proceeding would be quashed.

Galileo himself had at least some faint hopes of a result favorable to him. But he was mistaken. Besides taking his own depositions and declarations as to the character and purpose of the book, the tribunal had placed copies of the work itself in the hands of sundry learned men, who were required to examine it carefully and to make each one a separate report in writing. These reports had come in. They all agreed in stating that the writer of the book certainly held the Copernican theory, and that though clothed under the flimsy disguise of a dialogue with reasons *pro* and *con*, the work was really and truly intended to uphold the Copernican system and to obtain adherents to the same. It could scarcely be otherwise. For they were conscientious and intelligent. But what becomes of the repeated oaths of Galileo, who had sworn and protested the contrary?

According to the rules of judicial procedure at that time,—and especially according to the rules of the Holy Office, when there was a conflict of testimony,—when, as here, the author swears one thing and the book gives evidence to the contrary, the author on trial is to be subjected to what was called *examen rigorosum*, what we would term, a searching cross-examination. To this might, in certain cases, be added the menace of inflicting torture, and again in certain cases the torture itself might be actually used for the purpose of compelling a reluctant or prevaricating witness to speak the truth. All this, so far as the Holy Office was concerned, was regulated by established and clear rules. The Holy Office might imprison as a punishment, but it could not inflict torture *as a punishment*, much less death with torture. Where death was the penalty,

with or without torture, the criminal was remitted to the civil authorities, who could punish with death, and who, according to the public law of that age, could inflict death, by fire, by breaking on the wheel, or by other modes of torture. In the Holy Office the torture could only be used for the purpose of extracting the truth from a witness, and then only when there were grave reasons for believing that the witness was swearing falsely. Nor always then. Children under fourteen years, women that were pregnant, the feeble and sick, and old men, could not be tortured, though in certain cases they might be menaced with it. And no witness whatever could be subjected to torture, in any case, save on the order of a full bench of judges, who after consideration deemed it a necessary and proper procedure in that case in the interests of eliciting truth and securing justice. The course of the Holy Office (despite of anti-Catholic myths, etc.) was mildness itself in those ages, when the public opinion of every land approved and sanctioned the principle, and when the civil tribunals everywhere were ordinarily using torture and often to cruel excesses. In our country torture has been prohibited by the Constitution of the United States, and may not be used in judicial proceedings. But it is not a century since other nations have given it up. We have heard whispers of its not being unknown or unused in our own army and navy and in our Penitentiaries. In fact, so long as parents think it necessary to whip a child to make it tell the truth, or as a mob of regulators will string up a guilty wretch, whom they have caught, time and again, to some bough, in order to force him to disclose the names of his confederates or to reveal where the stolen plunder is secreted, we must confess that some at least still retain in their bosoms the principles that were prevalent two centuries ago.

On June 21st, 1633, Galileo came before the tribonal for the cross-examination, called for by the discrepancy between his own sworn testimony and the recognized character of his book. He was first asked had he anything which he wished to say voluntarily and of his own accord. He had nothing to say. Did he hold, or had he held, and for how long, that the sun is the centre of the world, and that the earth is not the centre of the world, and also that it revolves on itself daily? A long time ago, before the Congregation of the Index had decided the question, and before the Monition was given him, he had looked on the two opinions of Ptolemy and of Copernicus as equal; either might be true. But since that decision he had no longer any doubt, and had ever held as most true and beyond dispute the opinion of Ptolemy, that is, that the earth stands still, and that the sun moves. They objected to him, that in the book which he had written and printed since that decision, the opinion of Copernicus is set forth and defended.

Was it not clear that he had held it? His answer is substantially what he had said on previous occasions. "I was not moved to write that book, because I held the Copernican opinion to be the true one; but because I thought I would do a service to the public by setting forth the natural and the astronomical reasons in favor of that, and of the Ptolemain opinion; and by showing that such reasons are not conclusive for either, and hence that to decide with surety, one must have recourse to higher teachings. This is plain from many and many passages of my book. Therefore I conclude, saying that for myself I do not hold, and since the decision already mentioned, have not held the condemned opinion." The examiners were not satisfied. They object to him again, the text of the book, and the reasons adduced in it in favor of the Copernican theory, that the earth moves and that the sun is stationary. Hence it is clear that he holds said opinion, or at least that he did hold it, when he was writing the book. Let him confess the truth, else they may use against him the appointed remedies of law and fact. His answer was: "I do not hold nor have I held this opinion of Copernicus, since it was intimated to me with command, that I should abandon it. For the rest, I am in your hands. Act as it pleases you." And again he was told to speak the truth, else they would have recourse to the torture. His reply was: "I am here to obey. I have not held this opinion, since the decision made on it, as I have said." The notarial account goes on: "And since nothing more could be obtained for the purposes of judgment, his subscription was taken, and he returned to his apartment." The document is subscribed, *I, Galileo Galilei have sworn as above.* This is the closing paper of the trial. It is not any more honorable to Galileo than were his preceding examinations. It is evident that he did not swear the truth. His judges thought so. In an ordinary case perhaps the witness would have been submitted to the torture. But as a matter of fact, Galileo was not subjected to it; and as a matter of fact, though he might be and was threatened with it, that was only a legal formality of court procedure. It could not be inflicted on him according to law. He was too old, being in his seventieth year, and besides he was suffering from hernia. There was not even a consultation of the officials on the subject. The matter was too clear for doubt. The menace was, as we said, only an established legal form,—as much so as when nowadays a criminal is asked is he guilty or not guilty.

On Wednesday, June 22, 1633, Galileo was taken by the Fiscal in his carriage to the Minerva, where the Congregation of the Holy Office was accustomed to hold its larger and more solemn meetings. Here before the assembly, and in his presence, Galileo's sentence was pronounced. After rehearsing in a lengthy preamble

the entire history of the case, the Monition given him by Cardinal Bellarmine in 1616, and his violation of it, his double dealing in the matter of obtaining the *Imprimatur* for his book, and in disregarding the requirements of the Master of the Sacred Palace for its publication, and the character of the work, it concludes that although his replies before the tribunal were sound and Catholic, still his whole course had made him "a suspect of heresy," and he had been guilty of violations of law charged on him. The tribunal decreed therefore 1st, That Galileo should make an abjuration of the Copernican theory. 2d. That as a penance, he should recite once a week for three years the Seven Penitential Psalms of David. 3d. That he be imprisoned in the Holy Office at the pleasure of the Congregation.

The abjuration apparently cost Galileo no difficulty. It was only repeating again in the legal phraseology of the tribunal, what he had already sworn to, repeatedly, during his trial. He pronounced it at once on the spot. As to the second part—the recitation of the psalms,—we have no account of how exactly he fulfilled that portion; but we hope he did it well, for his previous life had not been edifying. At seventy he might well lament the follies and sins that stained his earlier and his mid-life. As to the third portion, our information is full. Galileo returned the same day with the Fiscal to his apartments. The next day the proceedings were officially reported to the Pope, as was necessary before carrying the sentence of imprisonment into execution. The Pope at once directed that the imprisonment be commuted to a relegation to the Villa Medici, in the bosom of Nicolini's family, until further orders. The very next day, Friday, June 24th, the directions of his Holiness were duly recorded by the officials of the Holy Office and carried into effect, and Galileo was at liberty to go to the Villa Medici. Nicolini writes on June 26th to Cioli in Florence: "Last Monday evening, Galileo received a summons to attend the Holy Office. On Tuesday forenoon he went thither in obedience to the mandate, and was retained there. On Wednesday he was taken to the Minerva, where his sentence was read to him. On Thursday his Holiness commuted the sentence of imprisonment to a relegation to the Trinità del Monte (the Medici Palace), whither I brought him on Friday afternoon." His return was not delayed one hour beyond the time required for the ordinary formal procedure of the courts in such a case.

Galileo's relegation to the Villa Medici did not last long. All knew that the severe heats of July in Rome would tax him severely. Accordingly on June 30th, the Pope consented to his departure for the pleasant city of Sienna, where Monsignor Piccolomini, the Archbishop, an intimate friend and devoted admirer,

was awaiting him, and would provide for his comfort. The gracious permission was officially intimated to Galileo on July 2d; and on the 6th he started on his journey. "He left us," writes Nicolini, "in excellent health." Galileo himself in a letter from Sienna tells of the relief he had enjoyed during his journey from the balmy mountain air, and how he walked several miles along the road, for pure pleasure of the exercise. Evidently the physical frame of this man of seventy had not been subjected only a fortnight before to the severe shock of torture on a rack, or otherwise. His stay in Sienna was very pleasant to him and lasted until the end of November. He received from Rome permission to return to his own home, the beautiful and much-loved villa of *Arcetri* in the suburbs of Florence. He writes from that place in December expressing his great gratification, and his thanks to the friends in Rome who had obtained the favor. Here, with his telescopes and philosophical apparatus, and surrounded by his books and by his friends, Galileo continued his scientific labors, until advancing years, some say, intense astronomical observations of Mars through his telescope, deprived him at last of sight. He died January 8, 1642, at the age of seventy-eight.

The discoveries of Galileo, though brilliant and worthy of note in the early history of astronomy and physical science, are not the real cause of the celebrity which he has attained. This is due to his trial before the Holy Office, of which the documents discovered or published of late years have enabled us to give a brief but sufficiently detailed account. The fabulous narratives of his sufferings, imprisonment, and tortures, are exploded by these testimonies of Galileo himself, of his friends, and of the original acts themselves of his trial. If ever one was honored, each time that he visited Rome, it was Galileo. If ever one, brought before a tribunal to be tried on serious charges, was treated with extraordinary leniency and indulgence to himself personally, it certainly was Galileo. Nicolini wrote at the time in gratified surprise "that no bishop or prelate, or high dignitary would receive such consideration." With our ideas of the equality of all men before the law, and our dislike, in profession at least, to any acceptation of persons, we cannot understand it. But it was not always so. In England, in ancient times, education could plead the benefit of the clergy, and he, who had been educated, escaped at least for a first offence the gallows, to which his unlettered companion in crime was surely doomed. On the continent it was in some countries looked on as a crime against humanity, to put to death one who was *summus in arte*, no matter what his offence. Perhaps something of that reverence for eminence in science still existed in Rome, and made itself felt in Galileo's case. Perhaps it was only

a kindly feeling for one whom they had honored and sought to support in former years.

As we read his trial and listen to his own sworn testimony, our appreciation of the man must sink. He was not capable of uttering the *e pure si muove*, the jeu d'esprit attributed to him, but really invented by a witty Frenchman and put in Galileo's mouth, more than a hundred years after his death. Whatever else he may have been, Galileo certainly had not in him the stuff of which martyrs are made.

Nearly two centuries and a half have passed since Galileo's trial. The events of the life of that Italian philosopher, so far as he himself is concerned, have passed into the realm of history and have no interest for us to-day except as a matter of curious research. Of itself it might be readily dismissed. But there remains a question of graver and deeper and undying interest connected with him,—the charge against the Catholic Church of showing herself inimical to the progress of science, and moreover of having then pronounced false and against faith a teaching which is now universally recognized and accepted as true. Did not the Holy Office require from Galileo an emphatic abjuration of the Copernican theory.? Did not the Qualificatores stigmatize the main proposition of it as "formally heretical"? Did not the Congregation of the Index prohibit books upholding it, because it was "erroneous and entirely opposed to the Holy Scripture"? Did not the Church in all this condemn as heretical and contrary to true faith, a system which is now recognized as true; and has she not thus shown in fact that she can err in defining matters of faith? This is the charge often brought against the Church. We propose to meet it.

We say in the first place that this charge as presented against the Church is destitute of any solid foundation. The Church never made any such definition or decision of doctrine, and therefore did not fall into error in doing so.

The Church gives her decisions of doctrine, not through the declarations of any such tribunals as the Holy Office or the Congregation of the Index. These are only subordinate working offices or bureaus of her administration for the expediting of business. They are not clothed with her supreme authority. When she defines doctrine, it is through her General Councils and through the voice of her Supreme Pontiff, speaking *ex cathedra*, as Paul V. did, in 1616, by his Bull *Regis Pacifici*, on the Immaculate Conception, and as Urban VIII. did in 1641, in his Encyclical *In Eminenti*, against Jansenism. We cite those two documents because they were given at the time and by the Popes under whom the alleged action against Galileo and Copernicanism was taken.

The distinction is marked, and is clearly understood in the Church. It must be perfectly intelligible in every civilized nation that has a supreme court of ultimate appeal, the decisions of which are the law of the land in a sense in which the decisions of far inferior courts are not. It is not pretended that any decision whatever of a General Council, or any *ex cathedra* declaration of the Sovereign Pontiff was ever issued touching Copernicanism. Yet unless this can be shown, the whole charge falls to the ground. The infallibility of the Church in matters of doctrine is not brought into question.

What, however, did those tribunals do? In 1616, the Holy Office declined to act on the report of the Qualificators, and left it to slumber on their shelves. In 1633 it was rehearsed in the preamble of the sentence, as part of the legal history of the case, without receiving thereby any new weight. The abjuration required from Galileo was simply the repetition in legal terminology of his own repeated declarations under oath, and was not the decision of a mooted point, but the proper legal sequence of that testimony and of the course of the trial. It was always required of a "suspect of heresy," and, in the eye of the law, was not a punishment, but a privilege, by which the prisoner "purged" himself of the suspicion, which he declared to be unfounded.

We may speculate as to what would have been the outcome of the trial, had Galileo stood his ground and manfully upheld before his judges the truth of the Copernican doctrine. Had he calmly and cogently set before their minds grave philosophical reasons for holding that it was true, or even might after all be true, they were conscientious and intelligent men, and would have listened to him and would have striven to weigh his arguments. In saying this, we suppose his judges to be calm and impartial, if not even kindly disposed towards him, and not to belong to that class of men who for years had been filled with venom against him and who desired only to crush him personally. Such most evidently was not the spirit or temper of his judges; and hence it may be regretted that he did not manfully raise the question and appeal to their intelligence or strive to enlighten them. However, Galileo had nothing of a martyr's bravery in him. Moreover, the task was a difficult, perhaps in the existing stage of natural philosophy, an impossible one. The grand proof which Copernicus brought forward in favor of his system was its beautiful simplicity as compared with the intricacy of cycles and epicycles in the Ptolemean system. But then his planetary orbits were all circles, and each planet moved round the sun independent of the others. Had he known that the orbits were ellipses, not circles; that their ellipticity is ever varying from a maximum to a minimum; that for the earth at least

there are other variations in the orbits; that the planets interfere with each other, sometimes accelerating, sometimes retarding their respective velocities: if he had known these and still other points since discovered—even that the whole planetary plane of the solar system is rushing through space with an oblique, upward, and sidewise motion, at the rate of three hundred miles a minute—he would have felt his idea of beautiful simplicity vanishing, and the argument based on it, weak at its best, would lose all its force. Galileo used other arguments; one from the spots in the sun, and another, which was a hobby with him, from the tides of the ocean. However highly he prized them himself, and strove earnestly to explain and to propose them, his opponents could not be brought to see their force. They were right. We now know that he was altogether astray on both points. He had a far better argument, though he did not prize it so highly, in the crescent phases of the planets, Venus and Mercury, observable through his telescope. Yet even this could be explained on some other system, as it was by Tycho Brahe. In fact, in Galileo's day there existed no conclusive proof of the positive truth of the Copernican system. The first valid proof of it was presented to the world in 1687, more than fifty years after the trial of Galileo, when Newton had developed the law of universal gravitation and gave mathematical life to what had been only the empirical laws of Kepler. A second proof of the system was found in the succeeding century (1727), when Bradley established the law of the aberration of light. In our own day Foucault has made visible the diurnal motion of the earth by his well-known pendulum experiment. But Galileo knew nothing of all this. If he believed the truth of the Copernican system, it was in reality an opinion for which no absolutely valid argument could then be given. Others could not be censured for not blindly accepting his dicta. Still he would be far more deserving of respect had he truthfully stated his opinions, and done his best to maintain them. When the grandest advocate of the system in Italy proved recreant and denied it, and swore that he was able and willing to disprove it, what could the judges do but accept it as an unquestioned and unquestionable fact and truth in philosophy that Copernicanism was false. If false, it was contrary to Scripture, and deserved to be condemned whenever occasion called for the verdict. The Holy Office, in giving the Monition of 1616, had acted in the interests of peace, rendering no verdict, but requiring Galileo to keep silent. But in requiring his abjuration in 1633, the tribunal accepted from the scientific world of the day the datum that Copernicanism was false and absurd, and on that datum, supported, be it remembered, by the testimony of Galileo himself, they acted, so far as the dignity of the tribunal the ordinary course of legal procedure to be carried out. Their action is held to be wrong, because we now know the scientific datum to be

wrong. Had the scientific world of that day been right in giving it, the action of the tribunal would be not only blameless, but praiseworthy.

The action of the Holy Office in all this matter affected Galileo Galilei alone, and, as lawyers would say, did not travel beyond him personally. The action of the Congregation of the Index covered a wider ground, and may seem, therefore, of greater importance in the question which we are now treating. On March 5, 1616, this Congregation published a list of five works which were prohibited, and added the following paragraph: "It having come to the knowledge of the said Congregation that this false doctrine of Pythagoras, entirely contrary to the Holy Scripture, on the movement of the earth and the immovability of the sun, taught by Copernicus in his work *On the Revolutions of the Celestial Orbits*, and by Diego de Zunica in his work *On Job*, has already spread and has been adopted by many persons, as can be seen by the letter of a Carmelite Father, entitled 'Letter of Rev. F. Foscarini, Carmelite,' on the opinion of the Pythagoreans and of Copernicus concerning the movement of the earth and the immovability of the sun, and on the new Pythagorean system of the universe; printed at Naples by Lazarus Scoriggio (1615), in which the aforesaid Father strives to show that the said doctrine is true, and is not opposed to Scripture. The Congregation, in order that the said opinion may not be further spread, to the detriment of Catholic truth, has resolved to suspend the two works of Copernicus and of Diego de Zunica until they be corrected; to prohibit entirely and to condemn the work of F. Foscarini, and to prohibit also all other works which teach the same doctrine, as by the present decree it does prohibit, condemn, and suspend all and each of them." The very form in which the decree was published and its signature only by the Cardinal of St. Cecilia, prefect, and Fr. Magdalenus, secretary of the Congregation, show that it lays no claim whatever to be an *ex cathedra* declaration of the Church.

It is, nevertheless, in no small measure on this decree that the charge we are combating is based by those who know something more of the history of the case than the mere name of Galileo and the myths around it. Yet a little more study of history would have shown them that no such consequence actually followed or was apprehended in the future from the action of the Congregation. Certainly, Catholic nations for the last four centuries have not been laggards; in truth, they may be said to have led the way in the paths of science. Among them, Italy led the van, and in Italy, Rome herself was the leader. Her pre-eminence in classic literature, in *belles-lettres*, and in the fine arts has never been questioned. Few, however, know that her Accademia dei Lincei, of which

Galileo himself esteemed it an honor to be a member, was founded half a century before the Royal Society of England and the French Academy of Paris, and was the model on which they were formed. It died out for a time, but was revived and still survives. Many of the old-time essays and dissertations by its early members even now excite admiration and have a positive value in science. There was also in Rome the Physico-Mathematical Academy, one of whose members, Bianchini, was pronounced by Newton one of the first astronomers of the day. The Eternal City prided herself on her scientific and literary eminence in every branch. Commencing with J. B. Porta, Giovanni Fabri, Stelluti, Fabio Colonna, Cesi, Borelli, Torricelli, Bianchini, just named, Montanari and Bocconi, contemporaries of Galileo, an ample list of illustrious and able workers in physical science and in astronomy may be counted in Rome in every age down to the present century, graced by the names of Scarpellini, Del Vico, and the lamented Secchi. The names of Cassini, Schiapparelli, Piazza, Volta, and Galvani, Donati and Ferrari, are the glories of Italy, and are household words in the scientific world. In fact, the Italian scientific intellect has ever been marked by acuteness, farseeing, and broadness of views. Lyell, in his *Principles of Geology*, giving an account of the origins of that science, bears testimony to the fact. Speaking of the century before Galileo (1500–1600), he says: "There was sufficient spirit of toleration and candor amongst the Italian ecclesiastics to allow the subject to be canvassed with much freedom. They even entered warmly into the subject themselves, often favoring different sides of the question; and however much we may deplore the loss of time and labor devoted to the defence of untenable propositions, it must be conceded that they displayed far less polemic bitterness than certain (*English Protestant*) writers who followed them 'beyond the Alps' two centuries and a half later." And further on, speaking of the history of geology during two following centuries: "I return with pleasure to the geologists of Italy, who preceded, as has already been shown, the naturalists of other countries into the ancient history of the earth, and who still maintained a decided pre-eminence. They refuted and ridiculed the physico-theological system of Burnet, Whiston, and Woodward; while Valisneri, in his comments on the Woodwardian theory, remarked how much the interests of religion, as well as those of sound philosophy, had suffered by perpetually mixing up (as their English neighbors had done and have continued to do) the sacred writings with questions of physical science." It is unnecessary to accumulate additional testimony to the same or similar effect.

We really cannot understand how men, claiming to be conver-

sant with the history of the progress of astronomy and physical sciences in Catholic Europe, in Italy, and especially in Rome, can fail to see that there never was any hampering of the scientific intellect there, and, consequently, that the *corpus delicti* being absent, there is no room for the accusation which has been made.

In fact the decree of the Index, which we have already recited, was not intended to have, was not calculated to have, and, as we have just seen, did not actually have, that effect. Let us go back to the words of the decree itself. It declares the Copernican system (1) *false*, and (2) contrary to Scripture. The second point is a consequence of the first in their minds, not the first a consequence of the second. That such is the real meaning of the phrase is clear from the collocation of the words, and, still more clear, from the fact that Copernicanism is not declared to be "formally heretical" but only "contrary to Scripture." Had the current interpretation of the Scripture texts in question been held to be absolutely true, already determined and unchangeable, and had it been used as the basis or premise of the argument, they could not have avoided styling Copernicanism as "formally heretical." The Congregation was indeed urged to do this by some of the consulters. But under the guidance of Cardinal Bellarmine, then the highest theological authority in Rome, and of other learned men, the Congregation of the Index instead settled on the wording which we possess. The texts in question had not been declared by the authority of the Church to bear a special meaning. They did not bear directly on any doctrine of divine revelation, the truth of which would require this special interpretation to be adhered to.

The interpretation which was universally given to them had indeed come down from past ages. Being sanctioned by the *consensus patrum*, it might not be disturbed in its lawful and venerable possession save on the discovery of new and irrefragable evidence requiring and compelling a new interpretation. Such new and irrefragable evidence the Congregation did not possess, and was assured by the scientific world of that day, and assured truly, had not appeared. The vast majority of the scientists of that day, wedded to the Ptolemean system, did not think it could ever appear. They were mistaken. But we know that in that age it actually had not appeared. Yet even while accepting the assurance of contemporary science, the Congregation was, as we saw, very careful. They deemed it prudent, perhaps a duty, at that time, when wild intrepretations of Scripture texts were leading men not alone to attack the authority and doctrines of the Church, but even the Divinity of the Saviour and the essential doctrines of Christianity, and the vital principles of Christian morality,—they deemed it, we repeat, a duty to close this opening through which a stream

was already flowing, which, simple and harmless as it seemed to some, would still lead, and perhaps soon, to a mighty flood of errors of every kind, and on the most sacred points. The slightest rivulet of water making its way through a levee on the Mississippi, if neglected and not remedied in time, may lead to a gigantic crevasse and a disastrous inundation. It was necessary to provide against the imminent danger, for men's minds were getting excited on the matter. It was also important not to hamper or retard the progress of scientific research and discussion. They effected both purposes by the decree. It prohibited books that taught Copernicanism as an established truth, but left all free to present it and develop it as an hypothesis. By the first, all discussion as to the Scriptural texts and their meanings was eliminated from the controversy; by the second, the fullest scope was left for the physical, mathematical, and purely philosophic or scientific examination and discussion of the subject. So the decree was understood at the time.

The very day after its issuance, Galileo himself, then in Rome (1616), in a letter to Picchena, so estimates its import. Bellarmine's view may be gathered from the extracts of his letters given in a former page of this article.

After his death, F. Grassi, in Rome, writing on the matter (1624), says: "When a demonstration shall be found to establish the earth's motion, it will be proper to interpret the sacred Scriptures otherwise than they have hitherto been, in those passages where mention is made of the stability of the earth, and the movement of the heavens, and this, *ex sententia Bellarmini*." In 1631 no less a personage than the Pope himself, Urban VIII., said to Cardinal Zoller: "The new system is not heretical. It is only rash. And there is no fear that any one will succeed in proving it to be absolutely true." In this forecast his Holiness was mistaken, but his words have their weight for the precise point before us. A year earlier (1630) he is recorded to have said to Campanella: "It never was our intention to condemn the Copernican system (absolutely); and if it had depended on us that decree never would have been made." At the date of its issuance he was only Cardinal Barberini, and had not pontifical authority. His words, however, indicate, what other evidences of the time show, that there were some among the ecclesiastical dignitaries who did not think the Congregation had acted with all desirable prudence.

The decree was recognized as a disciplinary enactment, made for prudential motives, in order to guard against a religious danger that appeared grave, and was so framed as to do this without infringing on the proper liberty of scientific research, as it certainly did not in effect. It seemed called for by the exigencies of the time. When these had passed, or under other circumstances, the decree

might be allowed to sink into disuse, or it might even be revoked. For that Congregation was free to change or revoke prior regulations made by it, whenever seeming sufficient cause was presented for such a course; and it has often exercised the right.

In regard to this special decree the world knows that it has been suppressed. We have said that the first strong mathematical proof of the truth of Copernicanism is found in the *Principia* of Newton, published in 1687, nearly three-quarters of a century after the issuance of the Index decree. Of that great work, it is said, that at its appearance, "not more than two or three of his contemporaries were capable of understanding it, and more than fifty years elapsed before it was thoroughly understood by the generality of scientific men." In Italy the work was welcomed, learnedly commented on, and admiration for it went so far that one even "wed it to immortal verse" in a very long Latin poem. Still the nature of Newton's argument is, that the system is true, because the laws of physical mathematics, which he developed, are fulfilled by the facts of the system. It is a development on a large scale of the original idea of simplicity and regular order, presented faintly by Copernicus. A long study was necessary to master Newton's proof; and its cogency was not always felt. After Newton came Bradley (1727) with his discovery of the Aberration of light as it travels from the distant stars to the earth, moving on in its orbit around the sun. This might be called a tangible physical proof of the theory. It required, indeed, to verify it superb instruments and a long-continued series of delicate observations. The amount of aberration at its utmost is very small. Even with the best instruments of that day, far inferior to those of to-day, errors might easily creep in. It was just such a problem as put the astronomers, especially in Italy, on their mettle. Finally, the common consent of all came to be that Bradley's observations were right, and that the long-desired proof was in their possession. The Congregation of the Index acted as it had been declared that it would act. In 1752 the decree of 1616, against teaching Copernicanism as an absolute truth, was revoked. It had been practically set aside at least ten years earlier.

Let it not be said that in the preceding pages we have presented a modern view of the question of Galileo and the Copernican theory, specially devised, because it is needed, in order to defend the Church in the present state of science, but that it is substantially different from the view entertained at the time of, and immediately subsequent to, the passage of that decree of the Index. We have quoted the testimony of Galileo himself, of Bellarmine, the greatest theologian in Rome at that time, and of Pope Urban VIII. himself.

We might have cited others writing in Rome, who equally bear us out. We prefer, however, to close with a few quotations, not from private correspondents, but from another class,—from theological teachers of high repute in that century.

Libertus Fromond was a Professor in the University of Louvain, and took part in the controversies of the day on Copernicanism. In 1631, fifteen years after the action of the Index, and two years before the trial of Galileo, he published a work, entitled *Ant-aristarchus*, against the new theory. In Chapter V. he propounds the question: "Should the Copernican theory be now held to be heretical?" In answer, he says that Catholic theologians hold the negative, "because they deny that the power of the cardinals (of the Index) in declaring doctrine is the same as that of the Pope himself." And he adds that "he, himself, cannot censure" those theologians "until he shall see something on the subject from the Pope himself, much more precise than what has hitherto been said."

Riccioli, a learned Professor of the University of Bologna, published a large work, in folio, the *Almagestum Novum*, in 1651. He must have spent years in preparing it. He advocates the Ptolemean system, and argues at length, and with a multiplicity of reasons, against Copernicanism. He, too, takes up the action of the Holy Office, and of the Index, in reference to that theory, and says (p. 489) that while, philosophically speaking, there was every probability that their action was right, and that certainly it deserved to be respected and obeyed, "still, one is permitted to believe that these same judges, if convinced of the contrary, whether by their own study, or by a clear demonstration given them by others, would revoke that censure." That censure he held to be based, not on the decision of a question of physical philosophy, but on a rule for interpreting Scripture which the Copernicans were violating. "Texts of Scripture are to be interpreted in their literal meaning, unless this contradicts other texts, or a doctrine defined by the Church, or a proposition of science established with absolute certainty." Moreover, "in this question," he adds explicitly, "nothing has been decided by the Sovereign Pontiff, but only by inferior delegated officials."

Fabri was Grand Penitenciary in Rome when he wrote, in 1661: "There is no reason why the Church should not understand these texts in a literal sense, and declare that they ought to be so understood, until the contrary be established by some clear demonstration. And if it should happen that some day such a demonstration shall be found,—which I can scarcely believe possible,—then the Church will not hesitate to declare that these texts are to be understood in a figurative or improper, and not in a literal sense."

Fabri speaks clearly on the question. He uses the term *church*, for the church acting practically through an inferior administrative tribunal,—the Congregation of the Index.

Caramuel was another eminent theologian of that century, equally if not more bitterly opposed to Copernicanism. In his *Theologia Moralis Fundamentalis*, published in Lyons in 1679, he examines this question, and lays down the proposition, that if the Copernican theory were not, of itself and by its falsehood, heretical before, it certainly did not become heretical in consequence of being thus condemned by the cardinals of the Congregation of the Index. "For such condemnations have only a practical force," that is, are only practical enactments regulating discipline, and do not rise to the dignity of dogmatic teachings of the Church.

These quotations, to which we might add others of the same century, show that the view we have presented of the celebrated decree of the Congregation of the Index, expresses the sense in which it was understood and acted on at the time. The decree was not a doctrinal teaching, but strictly a disciplinary enactment. The infallible teaching of the Church was not in question. The decree was based on the actual state of science at that time, as a condition precedent. It was in its character reversible, in certain contingencies, which, however, we may suppose most, if not all, of its framers really thought could never occur. When the contingency did occur, the decree was revoked. It was intended as a practical *mezzo termine*, or compromise enactment, for there were two contending parties. It was intended to safeguard the interests of religion, which the Congregation existed to protect, and to do this without trenching on the liberty of philosophical research into the facts of the natural world. That it did not so trench is patent to whoever makes himself conversant with the history of the progress of natural sciences in Rome and throughout Italy.

Still we may regret that the Congregation of the Index did not accept the wise counsels of Cardinal Barberini, and of others agreeing with him, and abstain altogether from enacting the decree. At least we would have been spared the trouble of writing and our patient readers the annoyance of perusing this long article. Still their mistake, if mistake it was, has its lesson needed, as we see from many recent communications in approved Catholic papers, even to-day. Too many are still disposed to bring out their interpretations of texts of Scripture on physical and natural questions for the purpose of peremptorily deciding, or at least of cutting short, the discussion of questions which the Church has left to the wise scrutiny and the critical judgment of those who give their life's study to such subjects.

In conclusion, the mature judgment of pious and intelligent

Catholics on the whole matter of Galileo and the Copernican system may be summed up in the words of the illustrious Tiraboschi, in his *Letteratura Italiana:* "In this we must admire the providence of God in behalf of His Church. For at a time when the majority of the theologians firmly believed the system of Copernicus to be contrary to the Holy Scriptures, God did not permit His Church to pronounce a solemn judgment against it."

IRELAND'S OPPORTUNITY—WILL IT BE LOST?

IT is clear to those who watch the phases of Irish national sentiment and agitation, that the country is nearing a crucial time, and that the year 1882 will decide, for another generation at least, whether or not Irishmen are equal to the call of a great and rare opportunity.

Events in Ireland and Great Britain during the past twenty years, have hurried on to the present or immediate contingency. Grade by grade the Irish people have been awakened and interested in the public movements, until they have arrived at a national unity that would be extraordinary in any time or country.

"The Young Irelanders" of '48 struck a bold note that aroused the enthusiasm and sentiment of Ireland. But the solid forces of the country, the farmers, traders, professional men, clergymen, and the well-to-do classes generally were not deeply touched. That movement passed like a fever, and the country sank into unhappy quiet again.

The Fenian movement came in the night to the sleeping nation, aroused the mechanic and laboring classes, and included many of the younger members of the more conservative elements of the higher social grades.

But still the people as a mass remained stolidly apathetic. The Church condemned the workings of the secret society. The farmers, traders, and well-to-do class held aloof, watching the

movement with undoubted sympathy, but unwilling to risk their lives and property on the terrible chances of armed revolution.

A fight of five to thirty in number and of five to a thousand in wealth and organization, did not appeal strongly to the minds of middle-aged and cautious men. The fever passed, as in '48; but, unlike the former experience, the country did not settle back for a generation of slumber.

The world had changed since '48; and Ireland had changed more perhaps than any other country. Thirty-seven years ago, when O'Connell was arrested, there was no potency in Ireland or for Ireland except the voice of the eight millions of impoverished people on her own soil. And England took special care that this voice should be heard as little as possible outside and inside the limits of the island. O'Connell, in his agitation for Catholic enfranchisement, had trained the people to pull together. But this work was done solely as he directed. He did not develop the idea of individual citizenship among the masses as well as that of organization. Backed by the solid support of the Catholic hierarchy and clergy, he issued the orders, and the millions, almost blindly, carried them out, and so the battle of emancipation was won.

In the Repeal agitation O'Connell adopted the same tactics. But the government had profited by the experience of the past. They knew now that the presence of O'Connell was necessary to the organization he had made. They removed him—took away the brain from the body, shut him up in prison as they have Parnell, and the natural collapse followed, with a movement that was all tail with one head.

But when Fenianism went down under the soldiers and constabulary, there grew out of its field of defeat an Idea. It was conceived in the brain of an Irish political prisoner in a Dartmoor cell—Michael Davitt. A man of great natural power, with a conscientious hunger for thoroughness of work and understanding, who admitted to his own heart that Irish movements had failed to affect England because they had first failed to enlist Ireland.

A national movement, to succeed, must be based on something sounder than sentiment. It must touch the common-sense of the people. The basis of sound nationality is the well-being of the individual citizen.

The outcome of this idea was the Land League. From its first meeting in the county Mayo, at which Mr. Davitt spoke to over ten thousand farmers, it was a success. The seed fell on fertile soil. The rackrented farmers were ripe for a movement that promised to break or lessen their crushing bonds. It appealed to

their moral force alone. It depended on the justice of mankind, to whom it appealed in all tongues and in every land. It was public and educational. The priests, largely taken from the farming class, saw the need of the reform and the legality of the means, and supported it strongly. The ablest Irish members of Parliament adopted its policy, and the acknowledged leader of the Home Rule party, Mr. Parnell, became by unanimous consent of Irishmen, the leader of the Land League.

Then came the famine of 1880, like a storm to blow farther the seed of the Irish agitation. Rackrented and poverty-stricken Ireland cried out from its ashes and sorrow for bread and clothing. England, alarmed as at a conflagration, at first tried the dreadful device of belittling or altogether denying the existence of the famine. But she could not stifle the cry of Ireland in 1880 as she had done in other emergencies. The world heard and recognized its agony and reality. Mr. Parnell came to America and told the appalling story of his country's wretchedness in every important city of the United States and Canada.

This was a memorable step for Ireland. On Mr. Parnell's return, the Land League organization, established on this continent to co-operate with the parent-body in Ireland, spread rapidly over the country, and is to-day the most powerful Irish organization that ever existed in America.

The arrest of Parnell and the other leaders, and even the lawless shattering of the Land League in Ireland by armed and ruffianly force, have been futile work for the English government. The arrest of Parnell differs from the arrest of O'Connell, because there are now, in this country alone, more organized Irish societies, and twice as many Irishmen, as there are in Ireland.

And every thousand Irishmen exercising in America the power of their moral force, are a leaven to be heeded more by English statesmen than the armed rebellion of the same men or their fathers in Ireland.

The Land League has succeeded. It has compelled the passage of a law that will lower rents, more or less. It has raised the Irish question into cosmopolitan attention. It has crystallized the national sentiment of the Irish people and their descendants in America, Australia, Canada, and other countries. But above all its good results,—it has nationalized the Irish farmers, traders, priests, and well-to-do classes, and they stand now ready and waiting for the next act in the national drama.

It is time for the curtain to rise again. When the Land League, aided fearfully by the famine, began its agitation, its timeliness and force were acknowledged by all Irish parties. The Home Rulers virtually subsided, giving the newcomers their place. The Revo-

lutionists looked on with unfriendly eyes at first, fearing that the land movement, which only aimed at a detail, would distract attention from the National idea. But as they watched, they saw that the new agitation was raising the farmers and tradesmen into activity, and after a time the Land League was left alone in the field, to work out its purpose as best it could.

Now, it must be asked and answered: Where does the Land League propose to end?

Mr. Parnell's object for the organization, expressed more than a year ago, was the expropriation of Irish landlords,—which means the purchase of the land by the government, and its re-sale on easy terms to the Irish farmers. Ireland does not want this to-day, and would be most unwise to accept it. If England during the past two years had had statesmen of first-rate quality, she would have speedily offered this settlement; and had the people of Ireland accepted her offer they would now find themselves more inextricably bound to Great Britain than ever the act of Union bound them.

If the English government purchases the land from the landlords and resells it to the farmers of Ireland, the world's opinion will hold these men bound to their contract. The legitimate outcome of the Land League is therefore not national. It was never meant to be national. On the contrary, it would be the doom of Irish nationality, at least for a full generation, until the debt of the farmers to the English government had been repaid.

Some, and many, will say that Ireland, even in case of such a sale, would owe England nothing, in view of the centuries of wrong and robbery. This is doubtless true in equity; but why make a contract at all? It will not help matters anyway. Better to preserve the integrity of the Irish farmer, even though he should starve. If the present 630,000 tenant farmers, augmented by at least a million more, as they would be, were to agree to buy from England the land of Ireland, meaning to break the bargain by a revolution next year, their conduct would be, in the mildest judgment of other nations, deceitful and discreditable.

It is not necessary to do this. For the best interests of Ireland it must not be done.

"But," it will be said by some Irishmen, "the Land League means to abolish rent altogether." It means no such thing. It has never said so, nor has it ever so intended. Such a proposition is absurd, so far at least as the present Irish question is concerned. It is a social theory which no country has yet accepted. No sensible person expects poor Ireland, struggling for very life, to voluntarily burden herself also with a socialistic millstone that would probably sink the United States.

Therefore, if the Land League has only one legitimate purpose,

and if Ireland has reason to reconsider that purpose, it is time to look ahead and take new bearings.

The aim of Ireland in doing this is fortunately assisted by time and tradition. The year 1882 is the centennial of the Irish Parliament obtained by the agitation of Henry Grattan. The progressive issue of the land agitation is a demand for a government of Ireland by the Irish themselves.

Circumstances never worked more fortuitously to an end than here. The Land League has accomplished its work so far as it can safely and wisely be accomplished. The whole people are aroused. The English government, at its wits' end, is apparently ready to listen to a proposition from Ireland that will restore peace without dismembering the empire. The present Prime Minister and many other leading Englishmen have clearly so expressed themselves, and without damnatory criticism by any English class or party.

Ireland in 1882 ought to agitate for and demand her own government. No matter by what name the movement is called, whether Home Rule, Repeal, or Federation. The result will be practically the same. The natural resources of the country will be worked and cherished by its own people. The official life will no longer be an alien and inimical network spread over the island. The insolent presence of soldiery and armed constabulary will disappear. The dignity of a people upholding a nationality they are proud of will take the place of the servile helplessness of an almost pauper population.

We do not fear for Ireland's future in a federal union with England. Nature has given the lesser country inestimable advantages. The anti-trade laws passed by England in the last century are proof that even then she feared mercantile and manufacturing competition with Ireland. The intelligence of commerce will steer its merchant ships into Ireland's southern and western ports, to avoid the dangers of the fatal English Channel. The unrivalled water-power of the rivers, from whose tumbling streams even the flour-mills have disappeared, will drive the wheels of manufacture into rapid competition with Lancashire.

If the landlords of Ireland are to be bought out,—and we see no other way for the farmers to become proprietors, unless the government drive the people into revolution,—it is better that they should be bought out by an Irish rather than an English Parliament.

And if, after a fair trial of the federal union, it were found that Ireland suffered by the bond, that she was outnumbered in council, harassed and injured by imperial enactments, that in fact it was an unequal and unbearable contract, then still there remains the ultimate appeal of an oppressed people,—separation even by the sharp edge of violence.

The next step for Ireland is obviously not revolution. She has been for the past four years a model to the world of intelligent, peaceful agitation. Her people have pursued their legal purpose with marvellous patience, tenacity, and temper. They have not broken the law, under terrible excitements and in constant presence of the flaunted arrogance and ruffianism of unnecessary military power. They have achieved the greatest of all triumphs in compelling their powerful opponent either to yield or to break all the laws that it had itself invented to oppress and hamper the weaker country.

A people with such political intelligence and fertility need not fear federation with England. If Ireland can beat her even under present disadvantages, she will assuredly hold her own under a fairer relationship.

The men who recently issued a Home Rule manifesto in Ireland were undoubtedly right. They struck the proper note exactly; but they did it with uncertain hand, for their utterance has already faded into silence, though it met with no serious opposition.

The people of Ireland are, to-day, without a national policy. The splendid Land League organization goes on grinding, but it is not grinding toward nationality. Its great-hearted work for the present winter is to protect the evicted families of farmers who refuse to pay rent because England has outraged even her own laws. But Ireland cannot go on forever fighting with all her forces against a minor evil. If she go on for six months longer, England will open her eyes to her opportunity, and bind Ireland in new hemp by the sale of the country to the farmers.

The late Irish-American Convention in Chicago might well have started the national proposition. Had that meeting spoken for an Irish government in Ireland, with the Union repealed, and a federal union substituted, Ireland would have answered like one man. That meeting did not so speak because a few men antagonize the Home Rule idea, and declare that they will have nothing less than utter separation from England, with a republican and socialistic government for Ireland.

To obtain these two objects Ireland must fight England with arms. She must seize all the strong places, at present occupied by fifty thousand armed men. She must, in one month, put in the field an army of at least one hundred thousand men, equipped with engineers and artillery; England in the same time will land on her shores at least that number of soldiers. She must establish a fleet to keep herself from suffocation if not starvation. And she must fight out a desperate conflict for existence, without a hope of borrowing fifty dollars in foreign markets on her national promissory note.

What sensible Irishman favors this policy? What earnest revolutionist is prepared to wait until all this can be done before Ireland obtains a Parliament of her own?

The sooner Ireland in America speaks on this point the better. Many earnest Irishmen, among the leaders in Ireland, firmly believe that Irish-Americans are all blood-and-thunder radicals. This belief restrains action among them. One of the ablest of the leaders now in prison, recently wrote the writer that the belief is widespread in Ireland that the Irish-Americans will have nothing less than absolute "no rent," and ultimate revolution.

Such a belief is utterly wrong. Even the revolutionary party in America condemn as absurd the absolute "no rent" proposition. This party, too, sees that Irish Home Rule in no way conflicts with their own more consummate settlement.

Another, and a very grave reason for an expression of policy, is that the best intelligence, both in Ireland and America, will withdraw from a movement that either cloaks its ultimate purpose, or has none. Already the Land League has suffered deep loss by the vagueness of its drift. One American bishop has publicly uttered his disapproval of an organization which he could not understand; and the Catholic clergy generally have, it is believed, a secret and a growing feeling, in regard to the Land League, that they are dealing with an occult and uncertain organism.

To allow so great an organization to collapse through blind management and lack of purpose would be calamitous. To fight the landlords and support the evicted tenants is not a national policy—it is not enough. When the land question is settled, the question of an Irish government for Ireland will be no nearer solution than at present.

A demand for Home Rule by the Irish people, supported by their representatives in Parliament, will obtain sympathy in all countries, and particularly in America. The Land League has demonstrated its necessity to the world. It will give life to the magnificent organization which now has nothing to do but raise money. It will receive instant and thorough approval and support from the Catholic hierarchy and priests, both in Ireland and America, and from intelligent and conservative men who have hitherto avoided all Irish national movements.

Unless this demand is made, and soon made, the Land League organization will dwindle into insignificance, and an opportunity such as Ireland has not seen for a century will be lost.

THE EARLY FRANCISCAN MISSIONS IN THIS COUNTRY.

Luis Geronimo de Ore, Relacion de los Martires de la Florida, 1604.

Memorial que Fray Ivan de Santander de la Orden de San Francisco, Comissario General de Indias presenta à la Magestad Catolica del rey Don Felipe Quarto, Hecho por el Padre Fray Alonso de Benavides, Custodio de las Conversiones del Nuevo Mexico. Madrid, 1630.

Histoire du Canada et Voyages que les Frères Mineurs Recollects y ont fait pour la conversion des infidelles. Par le F. Gabriel Sagard Theodat, Mineur Recollect de la Province de Paris. Paris, 1636.

Description de la Louisiane. Par le Père Louis Hennepin. Paris, 1683. Translated, New York, 1880.

Establissement de la Foi dans la Nouvelle France. Par le père Chrestien le Clercq. Paris, 1691. Translated, New York, 1881.

El Peregrino Septentrional Atlante, delineado en la exemplarissima vida del Venerable Padre Fr. Antonio Margil de Jesús. Valencia, 1742.

Relacion Historica de la Vida y Apostolicas Tareas del Venerable Padre Fray Junipero Serra, y de las Misiones que fundó en la California Septentrional. Mexico, 1787.

Travels in North America. By M. Crespel. London, 1797.

BUT a few years since men traversed this broad land in every direction, wrote of it and described it, treated of its history even, with scarce a thought of the early pioneers of the Cross, who facing every danger went from tribe to tribe announcing the truths of the gospel, and seeking to win the natives from the idolatry and superstitions into which they had sunk.

Light has penetrated the darkness,—the history of the United States as now understood devotes to the early Catholic missionaries chapters which for heroic grandeur, for self-devotedness, courage, and perseverance, are unsurpassed. The long-bred aversion to the religious of the ancient faith yielded to the instinctive reverence awarded by an honest heart to virtue of heroic mould.

Yet it is chiefly to the Jesuit laborers in the mission-field that the credit is given. To them Bancroft devoted glowing pages; it was their letters that Bishop Kip gleaned and translated; and to them Parkman pays tribute in his *Jesuits in North America*, without covering all their labors in the pages where his vivid style invests his long research with all the charms of an epic.

But great as were the labors, the sufferings, and the zeal of the

sons of St. Ignatius, it would be unjust to rivet the attention solely on them. They were not alone in the field. Side by side with them labored the sons of St. Francis; still full of the generous ardor and intrepidity of their earlier days. Sometimes they preceded the Jesuit Fathers, as in Canada, or succeeded them, as in Florida and California, or were the sole regenerators and spiritual conquerors of fields peculiarly their own, as in New Mexico and Texas. They are, however, too little known, and the works recording their services have not been made accessible to the general reader, yet in their annals stand out in grand relief men who would be venerated in the history of the Church in any country. Mark of Nice, Caron, Le Clercq, Margil, Serra, Massey, Bishop St. Buenaventura Tejada, and their glorious army of Franciscan Fathers, who sacrificed their lives on the missions within our limits, were men of no ordinary virtue and ability.

The Franciscan history in this country opens with Father Juan Xuarez and Brother Juan de Palos, two of the Apostolic Twelve who founded their order in Mexico. With three other friars of St. Francis they zealously went, in 1527, to Florida, hoping to raise up a new Christendom in the realm which the Adelantado Pamfilo de Narvaez was to add to the dominions of the Spanish king; but the expedition, ill conceived and ill managed, involved all in destruction, and the good Franciscans crowned their lives of mission zeal by Christian patience and fortitude amid disaster, suffering, and starvation.

When the survivors of that expedition reached the shores of the Pacific, and Alvar Nuñez, whose curious family name was Cabeza de Vaca, or Cow's Head, told of the strange half-civilized tribes he had met in his long and unparalleled wanderings across the continent, a Franciscan stepped forward ready to bear the gospel to them, with the graces of which Christ made his Church the channel to men. Alvar told how five Fathers of St. Francis had perished on the coast of Florida, but the brave Friar Mark from Nice and the sunny Riviera did not recoil. Open the grand old folios of Ramusio, clear and handsome, though printed in 1565, and read Father Mark's narrative telling how "with the aid and favor of the Most Blessed Virgin Mary, our Lady, and of our Seraphic Father St. Francis," he with Friar Honorato set out from San Miguel de Culiacan, on Friday, the 7th of March, 1539. Soon after Easter the intrepid missionaries reached Cevola, one of the New Mexican towns, with its curious houses rising story after story, offering no means of entrance but by ladders. The people were decently attired in cotton garments and robes of buffalo and other skins, with gold and silver vessels, and turquoises, used both as ornament and as

money. Here he planted the Cross, and nearly three centuries and a half ago initiated a mission of his order which was for years to spread Christian light over the interior of the continent.

Father Mark opened the way, but the mission was not effectively begun till many a zealous Franciscan had laid down his life in the attempt to win the natives to listen to the Christian doctrines of which he was the herald.

While the Friars Minor were thus aiming at the spiritual conquest of New Mexico, Florida summoned them. The Dominicans, pioneers of the Faith on our coast, had bedewed the soil of the peninsula with the blood of the martyr of obedience, Father Luis Cancer, and his companion Garcia. They had labored on the shores of the Chesapeake, but discouraged by the obdurate and animal hearts of the people, they had turned to other fields. The Fathers of the Society of Jesus came. Their missionaries announced the Faith from the Rappahannock to Cape Sable; they tried to convert the old and educate the young; but when the line of martyrs begun with Martinez, closed with Segura and his comrades, even the untiring Father Rogel lost heart, and they turned away from the sterile and ungrateful field.

It was no light undertaking to expect any meed of success where two such orders had failed. But the Franciscans were not disheartened. About 1590 the first attempt was made, and the pioneers felt so encouraged that two years later a body of twelve —the favorite number of the Franciscan apostles—eleven priests and a lay brother, began a series of missions, extending from Tolemato, now the cemetery of Saint Augustine, along the coast to Amelia Island. Each mission station had its chapel, its house for instruction, and the reception of those who came to see the Fathers. The missionaries labored earnestly to establish morality, to prevent polygamy and licentiousness. The better disposed readily entered into the views of their new teachers, and Christianity found many ready to embrace its doctrines, but the lawless fretted under the strict rule, and sighed for the old system of license and licentiousness. A young chief resolved to rid the country of the missionaries, and easily drew some of the licentious into the sanguinary plot he formed. In 1597, stung by the reproof of Father Peter de Corpa, the Franciscan missionary at Tolemato, he killed him as he knelt before his altar. The confederates at once rushed to the other stations to complete the work. Brave Father Blas Rodriguez, met the murderers, and professing his readiness to die, asked only time to offer once more the holy sacrifice. The cool courage of the brave priest touched even the brutalized hearts of these men. They consented, and flung themselves down in his chapel with all the stolidity of their race, to wait till the doomed

priest had said his last mass. When it was ended, he calmly knelt before it to receive the death-blow from a tomahawk. Two other missionaries, Father Auñon and Father Antonio de Badajoz, were killed at Ossibaw, and Father Velascola at Asao. One only escaped; he fell into the hands of the Indian, who spared his life, only to make him die daily in the torments and outrages inflicted on him.

The Franciscan mission in Florida seemed annihilated, but other Fathers were ready to take their posts on the ground reeking with the blood of their brethren, to restore the chapels, and resume the instruction of the natives. The missionaries sought no vengeance, but the Spanish authorities punished the offenders with sound judgment, in order to prevent a recurrence. The evil-disposed Indians submitted or withdrew. The missions entered on a new era of prosperity, and the Fathers so increased in number that in 1612 Florida was formed into a province of the order.

By this time they had gained a permanent foothold in New Mexico. Father John de Padilla, Brother John of the Cross, Father John of St. Mary, Father Francis Lopez, Brother Augustine Rodriguez, had all fallen victims to their zeal, but in 1595 Don John de Oñate entered New Mexico with a well-equipped expedition, accompanied by eight Franciscan missionaries, selected by the Commissary-General Father Peter Pila. The superior of this body was Father Roderick Daran, but he was not equal to the task; and having been compelled to return, Father Alonzo Martinez was appointed and became the founder of the missions in New Mexico. How these prospered may be seen in the statement made to the king of Spain in 1630, that up to that time eighty thousand had been baptized. The fruit at first had been small; but the Franciscans persevered; as one sank beneath his labors and hardships, another took his dangerous and difficult post. In 1622 New Mexico was formed into a custody, and Father Alonzo Benavides appointed the local Superior. His memorial to Philip IV. gives a full picture of the Church established in the heart of the northern continent. The Pecos were all converted and churches established at Socorro, Senecu, and Civillata; the tribe of Tioas followed their example, and the Catholic churches of Sandia and Isleta antedate any raised on the Atlantic coast; the Tompiras, Sanos, Pecos, Teoas, Hemes, also embraced the faith. Though the Pécuries at first resisted, and laid violent hands on the missionaries, they were at last overcome by the patience, humility, and unflagging zeal of the Franciscans, the missionary escaping from attempts on his life in a way that all regarded as miraculous. The Taos clung to the polygamy they had so long practiced. In vain the missionary preached and exhorted. An old hag, regarded

as a witch, exercised such an influence that she even weakened the faith of some women converted and married with the sacramental rites. Her death, by a stroke of lightning while she was plying her satanic wiles, aided greatly by the terror it inspired to commend the teachings of the priest. Acoma and Zuñi, both under the slavery of the medicine-men, had sturdily resisted the envoys of Christianity, but they, too, had yielded at last, while the truth was preached to the towns of the Moquis and the wandering tribes of the Apaches, as untamable two centuries ago as they are now.

To effect conversions in Florida and New Mexico required a knowledge of the various languages spoken, and even among the Pueblo towns on the Rio Grande, where houses, and arts, and progress seemed alike, the Indians were really of far different stocks, speaking several languages unlike in principle and form. Before the settlers of Virginia or New England had acquired any insight into the languages of the redmen, the Franciscans of Florida and New Mexico had reduced languages to rule and system, had all the needed rudimentary works on them, and were training Indian children to read and write. Many books were printed which remain as monuments of the zeal, learning, and ability of the early missionaries, who, like Pareja, acquired thorough mastery of aboriginal language and thought. Still further west Father Perdomo, after early essays in mission work in Florida, went with Vizcaino to be one of the first apostles of California, a pioneer of the coming work of his order in that land.

While the Spanish Franciscans were thus extending their labors in the south, from the Atlantic to the Pacific, other bands of Friars Minor were emulating their example in the north. France was occupying the valley of the St. Lawrence and the territory near its mouth. Champlain, the founder of Quebec, as soon as colonization showed promise of success, sought to obtain clergy for the French settlers, and missionaries for the poor heathen Indians, whose spiritual degradation excited his compassion. A man of robust and earnest faith, he felt the importance of religion for the well-being of the future state. He applied in the first instance to the Recollects or Reformed Franciscans of the Province of Aquitaine, in France, but various difficulties arose which prevented those Fathers from undertaking the good work. Father Garnier de Chapouin, Provincial of the province of St. Denis, of the same order, entered into Champlain's plans and obtained the necessary authority to found a mission in America. In the spring of 1615 a little party of apostolic men, Father Denis Jamay as Commissary, with Father John d'Olbeau, Father Joseph le Caron, and a lay brother, sailed from Honfleur in the St. Etienne, and on the day in May

when the order celebrates the translation of the relics of the holy founder, they anchored in the roadstead of Tadousac.

A vast field was before these clergymen. Chapels were to be erected at Quebec and the minor posts, Tadousac and Three Rivers; the French settlers were to be formed to the practice of religious duties, to which some had long been strangers, and the Indians, from the Saguenay to the friendly Hurons, on the upper lakes, were to be won from their barbarous fetichism to the knowledge and worship of the one true God. After Cartier's days, the first mass offered at Quebec, Tadousac, Three Rivers, Sault St. Louis, as well as in Upper Canada, was offered by these Franciscans. In the mission they formed Father Joseph le Caron is the great central figure, the real founder, a priest of great zeal, discretion, energy, and patience. He interested many leading men of France in Canadian affairs, brought over other Fathers to aid in the work, stimulated the study of the Indian languages, so that in a few years dictionaries were prepared of the tongues spoken by the Nasquapees at Tadousac, the Montagnais on the St. Lawrence, and the radically different language spoken by the Hurons, among whom Father le Caron himself founded the mission, wintering in their remote palisaded towns. One of these brave Franciscans, Father Nicholas Viel, perished, a victim to his zeal, having been treacherously hurled from his frail canoe, with his little Indian acolyte, at a rapid that in its name, "Sault au Recollet," still, after the lapse of two centuries and a half, chronicles his death.

Another intrepid son of St. Francis, Father Joseph de la Roche d'Allion, not only reached Upper Canada, but, seeking new mission fields, must have crossed the Niagara, and standing on the soil now claimed by New York, announced within the limits of our republic the truths of Christianity to the neutral Indians, amid the thunderous echoes of the great cataract. He wellnigh gained the crown of martyrdom, and another, Father Poullain, fell into the hands of the cruel Iroquois, and suffered great cruelty at their hands. Finding the labor far beyond the ability of his province, Father le Caron solicited the aid of the Jesuits, and the two communities labored side by side till the English, some years after, wrested Canada from the French.

When Cardinal Richelieu effected the restoration of the colony, he seems to have excluded the Recollects, offering the Canadian missions to his favorite order, the Capuchins, another branch of the great Franciscan family, and when they declined it, to the Jesuit Fathers, who have made their labors on that field so famous. It was not till years after that the brown robe and sandalled feet of the Recollects were seen in Canada.

The Recollects of Aquitaine, to whom Champlain had applied

in vain, assumed, in 1619, the charge of missions on the Acadian coast, and for several years threaded the forests from the Atlantic to the St. Lawrence, following the Indian trails, through woodland paths, over rugged portages, and down the rivers. The book describing their labors has eluded all the search and investigations of our "Americana" hunters. We know but little of their hopes and trials, the spiritual joy that buoyed them up, the obduracy that made them despond. We know that one of them, Father Sebastian, starting from Miscou to return to their chief mission-house on the river St. John, sank under misery and hardship in his forest journey, and died a victim to his zeal, alone in the wilderness. Others crossing to the St. Lawrence by the Rivière Loup, traversed territory that Maine now claims. This mission was in time broken up by the English, and though the Recollects, on the restoration of the country, renewed their work, Cardinal Richelieu replaced them by Capuchin Fathers.

This branch of the Franciscan order had for years missions on the sea-coast now claimed by Maine, New Brunswick, and Nova Scotia, zealously discharging the ministry for French and Indian. Men of renown, like Father Archangel of Pembroke, served with zeal on these coast missions; and not many years ago a Maine farmer turned up with his plough the leaden plate that had once been inclosed in the corner-stone of a chapel of Our Lady of Holy Hope near the river Penobscot.

When at a later period Catholics from the British Isles were sold as bondmen in the growing English colonies in America, the spiritual needs of these poor people, deprived of priest and altar and sacrifice, roused the sympathies of the French king, and English-speaking Capuchins were sent to the frontier posts to afford, when they could, the comforts of religion to the victims of bigotry and religious hatred.

Thus in the earlier part of the seventeenth century we behold Franciscans laboring on the southern and northern frontiers of our present territory; but it was not only there. In the very heart of the English colonies they were also found, some Fathers of the order having been sent by the Propaganda to Maryland at the request of Lord Baltimore, a few years after the settlement, and for some years they labored side by side with the Jesuit Fathers, till the occasion which required their presence no longer existed.

In the reign of Charles II. the Society of Jesus, from the effects of the civil war, which diminished and impoverished the Catholic body in England, and terribly thinned the ranks of the secular and clergy, was unable to send members enough to meet all the wants of the American mission. Again the English Franciscans came to the rescue, with some also from Scotland. From the year 1672

for full half a century humble and devoted Franciscans labored in Maryland and the adjoining colonies, not only caring for the scattered Catholics, but evidently winning converts to the faith. Every incident points to them as the pioneers of the faith in Pennsylvania, the founders of the Church in Philadelphia, where their mass-house and conversions, early in the eighteenth century, provoked angry comment. Of these Franciscan missionaries the prominent figure is Father Massæus Massey à Sancta Barbara, called by Oliver "a truly apostolic man," who on three different occasions discharged the duties of Provincial of his order in England.

About the time that the English Franciscans returned to Maryland, the Recollects of France received the object of their long vows and prayers, permission to resume in Canada the labors of le Caron, Viel, and Sagard. Political and worldly wisdom had excluded them on the ground that a new colony was no place for a mendicant order. The same false wisdom recalled them when it found that the Venerable Laval, bishop of Quebec, as well as all his clergy, secular and regular, held doctrines too severe for their liking. Four Fathers were dispatched from France in 1669, but tempestuous weather forced the ships back to the French coast; but the next year Father Germain Allart, who afterwards filled the see of Vence with honor, sailed from La Rochelle with Father Gabriel de la Ribourde and two other priests, as well as the artistic deacon Luke le François, recognized as a distinguished painter in France, and two lay brothers. The convent of Our Lady of the Angels soon rose from its ruins, and when other Fathers came they spread through Canada as useful auxiliaries on the outlying districts, and preparing for Indian missions and permanent work. Father le Clercq, the author, took his post at Gaspé, where, to instruct more promptly the Micmac Indians, he adopted some rude hieroglyphics he found in use among the natives, and developed them into a system by which he taught his flock their Christian doctrine and prayers so successfully that other missionaries, appreciating its immense value as an aid in their labors, adopted it so generally that to this day these symbolic prayers are to be found in every Micmac cabin, and a few years ago type were cut at Vienna, from which three books have been printed in these Franciscan hieroglyphics. Brother Luke le François adorned with the works of his hands many of the Canadian churches, and was undoubtedly the only artist of merit to be found in America north of Mexico.

A new field was opened to the zeal of the Recollects by the scheme of western exploration, colonization, and trade, projected by Robert Cavelier, Sieur de la Salle, but which, from his sheer incompetence, resulted ultimately in disaster, misery, and loss. The arms of Louis XIV. had wrested Artois from Spain, and many

Flemish Recollects from that province were sent to Canada. Several of these, Fathers Gabriel de la Ribourde, Louis Hennepin, Zenobius Membré, and Melithon Watteau, were named to attend La Salle's expedition, become chaplains at the posts he might establish, and found missions to convert the friendly Indians among whom they found docile to the world. A chapel rose at Niagara; another at Fort Crevecœur on the Illinois. Father Hennepin set out with two companions, and ascending the Mississippi reached its first fall, which he named after the patron of the mission, Saint Anthony of Padua, falling a prisoner into the hands of the Sioux, to whom he announced as he could the doctrines of Christianity. Meanwhile the venerable Father Gabriel de la Ribourde fell a victim to his zeal, having been murdered by some prowling Kickapoos. After a time La Salle, accompanied by Franciscans, descended the Mississippi to its mouth, connecting, as it were, the labors of the different nationalities in the order.

When later he sailed from France, ostensibly to settle the mouth of the Mississippi, but really to land in Texas and attack the northern provinces, rich in precious metals, Franciscans accompanied him, Fathers Zenobius Membré and Maximus le Clercq to perish by Indian hands in Texas, and Father Anastasius Douay, who was spared to return and chronicle the fate of the unwise La Salle.

The Franciscans in Canada, then with convents at Quebec, Three Rivers, and Montreal, did good mission work, and as chaplains to the French forts and king's posts were the pioneers in many of our dioceses. They were chaplains at Fort St. Frederic on Lake Champlain, at Niagara, at Erie, at Fort Duquesne (now Pittsburgh), at Detroit, where one, Father Constantine, was killed by the Indians. They attended expeditions, one, Father Emmanuel Crespel, recording in pages of deep interest his labors in Wisconsin and his later sufferings when shipwrecked on Anticosti. Some of these Recollect Fathers were employed in the Indian missions in Maine, and others, English by birth or speech, like Father Eyston, whose quaint signature, "Recollect Anglais et Pauvre Pécheur," still remains on registers, were placed near the frontier, to give comfort to Catholics in the colonies or to instruct in the faith English Protestants in Canada.

In Florida meanwhile the Franciscan missions, after several vicissitudes, were pushed in all directions, converting the various tribes, till the whole of the Apalaches were gathered into the fold. But with the progress of the neighboring English colonies new dangers came. The people of Carolina stimulated and led Indian expeditions to attack the villages of the neophytes, and return with numbers of "Indian converts of the Spanish priests," who were sent off to the West Indies to be sold as slaves. The Quaker gov-

ernor, Archbold, in vain protested against this cruel and unchristian system.

The devoted Franciscans had not only to behold the labor of years annihilated, their churches pillaged and burned, their neophytes slaughtered or dragged off as captives, but laid down their own lives amid the ashes of their children in Christ and of the altars they had reared. Sad was the fate of the mission of Ayabala, among the Apalaches, where Fathers John de Parga, Marcos, Delgado, and Manuel de Mendoza were butchered, beheaded, and given to the flames. So terrible was the destruction caused by these inroads, unprovoked and murderous, that in a few years the extensive missions, which had numbered twenty, with thousands of converts, were reduced to four, under the walls of the Spanish forts, and not numbering five hundred souls in all.

The Franciscans, however, pursued their labors among Spaniard and Indian, and found a new field in the negroes who escaped from slavery among the English. Early in the last century St. Augustine became the residence of a bishop, auxiliary to the bishop of Santiago de Cuba; it is an honor to the Franciscans that they can claim as belonging to their body this holy prelate, Francisco de San Buenaventura Tejada, who, after governing with zeal and ability the portion of the diocese assigned to him, was promoted to a see in Mexico, and died from the fatigue he underwent in making his episcopal visitation of the missions and churches in Texas, that great province forming only a part of his bishopric.

When La Salle's invasion of Texas convinced the Spanish government of the necessity of occupying that province, the Franciscan Father Damian Macanet accompanied the first expedition, and in 1690 returned with three Fathers, to found the mission of San Francisco and that of "Jesus, Mary, and Joseph." Disease and want soon swept away these early missions, but the Franciscans returned and renewed the attempt at various points, but after losing some of their members were again forced to await a happier time.

God soon raised up his chosen servant in the person of the Venerable Antonio Margil—venerable because the Congregation has proceeded so far in the matter of his canonization as to permit the use of the title. This remarkable and apostolic man was born in Valencia, Spain, on the 18th of August, 1657. From childhood he showed the greatest piety, a love of virtue, and a horror of offending God; his pious mother constantly instilling into his mind his obligation to seek perfection. At the age of seventeen he took the Franciscan habit in a very strict Recollect convent at Valencia, called "The Crown of Christ." His novitiate showed his real and solid virtue, which increased in fervor during his studies and at his

ordination. After laboring as much by example as by words at Denia he solicited the American mission, and was permitted to join Father Linaz, who was taking a number of new missionaries to the provinces beyond the seas. Arriving at Querétaro in August, 1683, he became one of the founders of the Apostolic College, which has ever since been a hive of zealous missionaries for Mexico. Yucatan and Nicaragua, Costa Rica and Guatemala were the first fields of his labors, his missions rousing all to new zeal and fidelity in their Christian duties. Years after the bishops in those parts attested the extent, thoroughness, and clearness of their labors, and the permanence of the good effected by his corps of missionaries. They visited the Talamancas, who had always refused to accept Christian instruction, and so won them that eleven churches were established in their territory. But the heathen element rose against them; the missionary and his companion were tied to stakes, and fagots heaped around them and fired. They escaped by what was deemed a miracle, but the Indians kept them as prisoners, without food for a long time, hoping to see them starve to death. When released they proceeded to the better disposed villages of the nation and converted many. They confronted the fierce Lacandones, and established a hospice of missionaries in Guatemala. His wonderful powers as a missionary, and the reputation of sanctity which he had already acquired, induced his superiors to recall him to Querétaro to direct the missionary college. After being here the father and propagator of the missions he returned to Guatemala, where he established a similar college. Here his ministry in reforming the morals, checking disorders, and restoring piety were attended by many marvels. Similar results attended his labors in other parts.

His next great work was the establishment of the Apostolic College at Zacatecas, worthy rival of that of Querétaro. Then, by direction of the King of Spain, he undertook the conversion of the Nayarits.

When missionaries were selected for Texas he was chosen Superior, and laid out the whole system of missions, but falling sick at the Rio Grande, seemed to be at the point of death. He received the last sacraments, and was left to die. Recovering, however, he followed his companions, who had begun their work under his directions, and he himself founded the mission of Our Lady of Guadalupe among the Nacogdoches, that of Dolores among the Ays, and a third mission among the Adayes, near the French post of Natchitoches. He even extended his ministry to the settlers there, not only saying mass for them, but hearing confessions and instructing them. Dolores became his home and the scene of his rigorous and penitential life, till a French invasion from Louisiana broke up

the missions. As soon as peace was restored he renewed the mission of St. Michael at Adayes, and having been appointed Prefect of the Missions *de Propaganda Fide*, established the mission of San Xavier and that of Bahia del Espiritu Santo, on the site of La Salle's fort.

Wherever duty called him, either as a simple missionary, or as local or general superior, he was regarded as a saint, and his sermons and missions and retreats produced wonderful fruits of grace. Failing in health he was summoned to Mexico, but reached his convent in a dying condition. Having made a general confession of his whole life, he received the last sacraments, and resigned himself to the will of God. The tidings spread through the city, and persons of all ranks hastened to see him. The holy man was troubled; "I wished to die and end my life," he exclaimed, "on some mountain among brutes and wild animals, and not in this holy place. God's will be done." He expired on the 6th of August, 1726, and was honored by all as a saint. The process of his canonization was soon undertaken, supported by the petition of the authorities in Mexico, and of the King of Spain; juridical investigations were made in the provinces of Guatemala and Mexico as to his virtues, labors, and supernatural gifts. The examination at Rome was favorable, and by apostolic authority his body was taken up and enshrined in a sepulchre in the sacristy on the 10th of February, 1778, in the presence of two bishops and under the direction of the Archbishop of Mexico.

Such was a typical Franciscan, a holy personage, connected with the Church in this country, who is unfortunately almost unknown among us, but whose process needs but a few steps to authorize the dedication of churches in Texas and Louisiana under his invocation as one of the blessed.

The missions founded and encouraged by Father Margil were continued, although several Franciscan Fathers shed their blood, martyred by those whose highest happiness they sought. About the time of the French revolution, the Spanish government by its action crippled the missions, and many were combined to enable the reduced number of Fathers to attend them. During the constant revolutions of the present century and the war on religion, the Franciscans were at last driven from Texas.

The missions of New Mexico prospered till 1680, when a revolt began against the Spaniards, headed by some secret adherents of the old idolatry. Twenty-one missionaries were butchered by the Indians, ungrateful for the long years of kindness. Church and convent perished. The next year, however, Father Ayeta revived the mission at Isleta, and in 1693 when Vargas restored authority eight Franciscan fathers returned to the land so dear to them.

When the missionary colleges were founded, New Mexico received some of the fervent priests trained in them. In 1812 there were twenty Indian pueblos and one hundred and two Spanish towns or ranches in New Mexico, all attended by the Franciscans. There, too, the Revolution wrought its work, and the habit and cord of St. Francis, so long identified with the faith in that territory, have disappeared.

The missions of Upper California were another fruit of the colleges with which the name of the Ven. Antonio Margil is associated.

They were founded by the illustrious Father Juniper Serra, the first in our territory being that of San Diego, established in 1769, soon followed by San Carlos de Monterey, San Antonio, Carmel, San Gabriel, San Luis Obispo, San Juan Capistrano. The first check was the destruction of San Diego and the murder of the missionary Father Luis Jayme by the Indians; but it was soon restored and new missions begun at San Francisco and Santa Clara. All these missions were remarkable for the thorough system introduced by Father Serra, a man of great zeal and piety, combined with extraordinary skill in the management of affairs. Each mission had its church and buildings; the Indians were collected, instructed in religion, and baptized when they were sufficiently prepared. They were weaned from their roving and precarious life, and trained to agriculture and the various trades. The missionary was the administrator of the little community, and under his direction the produce of the mission was regularly shipped to the Mexican ports and sold, purchases for the Indians being made from the proceeds. Each family received its earnings, and the whole was managed without causing a murmur or complaint. Happier or better communities probably never existed than the California Indians under the care of the Fathers of St. Francis.

Father Serra was made Prefect Apostolic by a bull of the Holy See, June 16th, 1774, and before his death had the consolation of seeing ten thousand converts in the ten missions he had established.

In time the number reached 30,000, but in 1832 the Mexican government dissolved the missions and seized the property. The Indians were scattered and left to perish; and when after some years California was acquired by us, the feeble remnants of the once happy mission Indians were ruthlessly swept aside or turned over to religious fanatics, who, hedged in by government authority, labored to root out religion from their minds.

When the diocese of the two Californias was created the Holy See made the Prefect Apostolic, Father Garcia Diego, the first bishop, and Fathers of St. Francis still at Santa Barbara continue the work of Serra and Palou.

The French colony of Louisiana was long a field for the labors of the Capuchin branch of the order. In 1722, with the consent of the Bishop of Quebec, the Capuchin Fathers of the province of Champagne undertook to supply priests for the various settlements; the Jesuit Fathers attending to the Indian tribes. When the province was transferred by Louis XV. to Spain, the Capuchins remained, and in 1776, the Bishop of Santiago de Cuba deputed his auxiliar, a Capuchin Father, Fray Cirilo, to visit Louisiana, as he had already done Florida. This good bishop introduced Spanish Capuchins, who were stationed along the Mississippi from New Orleans to St. Louis. With the change of flag, the cession to France, the sale to the United States, the Capuchins have ceased to be seen in this old field of their labors.

When our revolution opened this country to Catholic settlers and churches began to dot the surface of the republic, Pennsylvania seemed marked out as a home for the sons of St. Francis.

The pious Franciscan, Father Michael Egan, was authorized to establish a province of his order, and being raised to the new See of Philadelphia, his hopes seemed about to be realized, but the time had not come, and he died without accomplishing his design. A few Franciscan missionaries were scattered through the country, but no attempt was made to form a community, till at last in 1854, at the solicitation of Nicholas Devereux, of Utica, a little colony of Italian Recollects, Father Pamphilo de Magliano, with two other Fathers and a lay brother, with the blessing of the Holy Father, came from Rome and founded a house at Ellicottville, out of which has grown St. Bonaventure's Convent and College at Alleghany, sending missionaries to various dioceses, where they have labored with zeal and success.

Under the encouragement of Bishop Juncker, of Alton, Franciscan Fathers from Germany, about 1859, founded a convent and college at Teutopolis, from which arose others at Effingham and Quincy. Other communities have arisen at Oldenburg and Indianapolis in the diocese of Vincennes; at Jordan in Minnesota; at Louisville, Kentucky; at Paterson, in the diocese of Newark; among the Indians in the dioceses of Detroit and Green Bay; Croghan, N. Y.; Peoria, Ill.; Columbus and St. Bernard, Nebraska; at Cincinnati, and other points, with Conventual Franciscans at Syracuse, New York, and Chambersburg, New Jersey, which cannot be treated of in the pages of a review; nor is it possible to describe the revival of communities of the Third Order of St. Francis. Sisterhoods of various names and rules, all professing to revere St. Francis as their holy founder, have labored in education or works of mercy, from the early attempt of the Poor Clares down to our time.

One of the most remarkable events in our Church history is the revival of the Capuchins in Wisconsin, where two zealous priests, Rev. Bonaventure Frey, and F. Haas, feeling called to the religious state under that rule, obtained a Superior from Europe, under whom they made their novitiate and were received into the order. About 1864 they established the first convent, and the blessing of God was evinced in the fervor of those who came to solicit the habit. The community increased rapidly, and there are now Capuchin convents not only in Wisconsin, but also in the dioceses of Baltimore, New York, at Victoria, Kansas; at Fort Lee, in the diocese of Newark; at Pittsburgh and Herman Station, Pa.

Few perhaps are aware how the order founded by St. Francis is inwoven in the history of the Church in this country, and is still developing for good. In every direction we meet traces of the labors of earlier missionaries; the martyrs who have shed their blood for the faith on the soil of this republic number no fewer than fifty-five; it gave the earliest bishops who exercised jurisdiction in Florida, Louisiana, Texas, Pennsylvania, and California.

After what seemed the destruction of religious orders at the Reformation and the infidel uprising of the French Revolution, and its more recent apostles, one would suppose that in the order of human events the work of St. Francis of Assisi would disappear, but this country alone should teach these liberal tyrants the lesson that they can repress or crush for a time the growth of Catholic life and instinct, but they cannot root it out of men's hearts. Tyranny cannot be kept up forever; men tire at last even of the despots who flatter their worst passions. Sooner or later the time will come when they can no longer deny to Catholics the liberty which they so loudly claim to be the heritage of all men. The religious life is an instinct of the Catholic heart, and where that heart is left free to find expression, it will appear, as in the development of the Franciscans, which we have feebly attempted to trace.

St. Francis stands out the lover of Holy Poverty. He appeared when Europe, after the days of chivalry and the crusades had entered on a period of great commercial development, and the riches and luxury of the East were poured into the Western states. As pride had dominated before, so at this epoch the pursuit of wealth was in the ascendant. All sought to become rich, to accumulate hoards of money, and with this mad striving for temporal goods came luxury, pomp and show. To counteract this, God raised up the lover and apostle of holy poverty, one to whom wealth and all that wealth could buy, were but the dross they really are. His friars went forth preaching poverty, disengagement, mortification, to men who thought only of schemes and speculations for building up colossal fortunes.

It may well be in the divine designs to have hemmed in the territory of this republic in the early days by bands of these self-sacrificing heralds of poverty. The wild greed prevails even more here than it did in Italy in the days of John Bernardon. Every trade, every department is full of speculation, scheming, wild, mad, and dishonest. In the whirlpool men suddenly become immensely rich, and no luxury can be too great for them to gather around. The world is taxed to adorn their houses and persons, to spread the table with costly wines and viands that only a Lucullus could command. And yet so fickle is fortune's wheel that every one can point to millionaires of the past, who are now humbly seeking some petty employment, or who seek in death a refuge from despair, or who perhaps look through prison bars on the wild world dance on the edge of the precipice in which they too so lately joined with song and revel, blind and blinded to the danger, to the insecurity of the ground on which they stood.

Saint Francis is, above all, the saint whose life we Americans should study, and if the labors of friar and sister now, and the intercession of those who in former days trod with indifferent sandalled feet our gold-laden soil, and bedewed it with their blood, shed in testimony of the faith—if these have not lost their power, we cannot look for any more powerful to recall us all to the true Christian standard of disengagement from undue affection to the world that is passing away.

THE PROBLEM OF MAN'S DESTINY.

HOW MUCH HAS UNREVEALED SCIENCE DONE TOWARDS ITS SOLUTION?

IT might seem uncivil to tell the learned gentlemen who lately labored so patiently on the revision of the revealed Word of God, that they have been expending their labor and learning on a superfluous task. And yet to all appearances such an assertion would be a very near approach to truth. At the present day it has grown to be the fashion to dispense with revelation altogether. Science has weighed it in the balance and found it wanting. Philosophy has examined it and pronounced it absurd. Modern criticism has made little scruple of "changing the truth of God into a lie." The *fiat* of positive thought has gone forth; the decree has been read, and all the problems that present themselves for solution to the human mind, must henceforth be solved without the aid of supernatural light. All the solutions in which it has hitherto aided must be recalled and reconsidered. Its suggestions must be carefully expunged. Every trace of it must be eradicated, and every answer reconstructed without its baleful, misleading assistance.

In this overhauling process the whole catechism of human knowledge is likely to undergo a change. New answers will be given to old questions. New and strange questions are apt to be proposed for solution. Old and familiar answers which we have got by heart must all be unlearned. Back to school we must go, where our old-fashioned scholarship is sure to provoke the merriment of the precocious prodigies who are so much wiser in their generation, and believe themselves to be the children of light.

Before we commence the task of unlearning our misshapen knowledge, it may be worth while to see whether we have real cause to blush for our unwisdom, and to see how satisfactory the results of the new system may be; and seldom in the history of the scientific movement of the nineteenth century has there been a time more favorable for instituting such an inquiry, for science is just now grappling with the greatest of all questions, and scientific men find themselves face to face with the most momentous of all problems,—the solemn problem of man's destiny. What is man's place in nature? What is man's relation to the world in which he lives? What is his real position and duty in the universe of which he forms a part? Of all the syntheses which human thought has ever constructed, which is the true one, or has the true one yet taken true shape and form in any one of the numberless formulas given to us by any man or by any school of men? These are the

questions which present themselves for solution to those who have long since prided themselves in posturing before the world as the great intellects of our age, and it is an interesting study to follow them in their task, to note their helps and hindrances, or watch their failures and successes. For one portion of the world revelation has settled the question beyond the possibility of controversy; but science scoffs at revelation's answer, contemptuously flings revelation to the winds, and without its aid seeks to solve the problem, or, to use its own expression, undertakes to "construct a human synthesis."

That the scientists enter on a task not only beset with greatest difficulty, but also fraught with gravest responsibility, few will care to deny. The question of man's destiny is one that infinitely transcends in importance all others that can engage the attention of the children of men. It is for all men a question of deep, grave, and solemn import. Its solution affects equally every race of men under heaven. Not to one man alone, nor to one class of men, but to the entire human race will the true answer be a message of overwhelming significance. It has but one meaning for Christian, for Jew, for Greek, for barbarian. It matters little in what terms the question is couched; its meaning is the same whether expressed in the language of the believer, the skeptic, the theologian, or the agnostic. The Catholic Dr. Newman will frame this gravest of problems in the simplest of terms: "Why am I here? How came I here? Who brought me here? What am I to do here?" The same question is wrapped up in the words, nowadays so common, What is truth? And those words have the same meaning whether they fall from the lips of Pontius Pilate in Jerusalem, or from the pen of Dr. Ewer in New York. The world's troubled souls, harassed by hopeless search, and harrowed by anxious doubt, utter the same question in their earnest cry: Where is truth to be found? And it is the hidden spring of Plato's formula, in which he announces his "problem of philosophy": "For all that exists conditionally to find a ground unconditioned and absolute." Indeed it is a question which will not for a moment admit of comparison with any other. It is immeasurably paramount to all else. It is the central fact in man's story. It is the last word of human learning. It is the crown of all man's discoveries. It is the keystone of the arch of Truth, the Ultima Thule of all man's hopes and longings for further knowledge and further light. It is the pearl of great price, which gives a sterling value to man's entire life, and without it we merely grasp at uncertainties, we are as men beating the air. The discovery of its answer is the aim and end of every philosophy. Man's notion or conception of the answer is the beginning of every religion. It is the alembic in which all

philosophy is transmuted into religion; for religion is simply the performance of what philosophy has discovered to be man's duty, and his duty can be deduced only from the knowledge of his origin and destiny. There were in past history philosophies that had never been illumined by revelation; there were philosophies which had resolutely closed their windows against its light; there were philosophies that had swung away so far from its influence that the centripetal was forever lost; but all of them have left unfailing testimony that the question which swayed the empire of human thought,—whether in the schools of the Stagirite, in those of the Manichæan, in those of Descartes or Spinoza,—is the very one which is to-day before the tribunal of our scientists. And it could not well be otherwise. For it is the natural cry of the human heart forlorn of light. It is the difficulty of all religionless men. It is the ever-recurring refrain of all infidelity. Man cannot wander more than a step out of the path of revelation before he stumbles upon it. It confronts him at every turn; and no matter how in life he may have tried to ignore it, it watches in wait for him at the end of life, and he is at last constrained to seriously ask himself: After life,—what next?

He who undertakes, then, to solve the problem for mankind, undertakes a task of solemn responsibility. To trifle with the question would be to play fast and loose with a matter of most vital importance to all mankind. Levity of thought or judgment would be insensate folly. Presumption would be a crime little short of sacrilege. The answer covers sacred ground, upon which they who tread must tread with reverence. They who freely and unasked put themselves forward as the arbiters of human destiny assume a charge from which men less daring would shrink in dismay. The hopes and fears of humanity are irrevocably wound up in the true answer. To look earnestly in the face of each child of the human family, and without misgiving or hesitancy confidently assure him that the true story of man's destiny has at last been read aright, that his doubts and perplexities are at last to be solved, his hopes and fears to be forever set at rest, that the clouds which for ages have hung over this question, shrouding it in deepest midnight, have at last rolled away, and the clear vision of truth—absolute truth—has at last burst upon human sight, is a work of mighty moment, and one which will at once demand superhuman grounds for confidence. To boldly bid the world be of good heart, that without any supernatural light, and with the sole aid which human reason furnishes, the veil has at last been pushed aside, the clue to the world-renowned mystery has at last been discovered, that the "whence and whither" of human life has at last been disclosed to the eye of unassisted reason, would be to challenge the

credulity of all mankind, and to announce faith in a discovery which could be proved beyond all manner of doubt. All past attempts have resulted in such ignominious failure that it is little wonder if at last it should hesitate to pin its faith to every philosophic foible, or lend a credulous ear to each new scientific folly. On this question above all others will it demand proof positive from a philosophy that glories in calling itself *positive*. The world has been the victim of so many deceptions on this point that it is high time it should have learned the lesson of misplaced confidence.

Indeed the most striking consideration that meets the skeptic on the very threshold of the inquiry is that the world has reaped such a scanty crop as the reward of all its labors in the field of research. So vast a disproportion between the labor and its products is well calculated to chill the ardor and damp the enthusiasm of the most self-sacrificing devotee. He will at once discern that six thousand years of man's history has been wholly barren of result. The utter absence of even the most meagre knowledge might lead us to suppose that the field of inquiry was absolutely new. No mistake, however, could be greater. The human mind does not here and now put forth its energies for the first time. Frequently before and resolutely has it wrestled with the problem. Every age in the world's history has left ample testimony that it fully realized the magnitude of the issues bound up in the grave question. The inquiry is in our age the very reverse of new, and reason, presuming, on her own powers approaches the task by no means for the first time. It did not come into existence with Goethe, with Emerson, or Auguste Comte. It has been the stubborn problem of all knowledge, the provoking riddle of every century, the standing mystery of all time. The learning and wisdom of other ages have grappled fiercely with it, but grappled in vain. It has withstood the assaults of the best learning; it has perplexed the ingenuity of the best intellects; it has stranded the wisdom of the best philosophers. It has baffled alike the subtlety and sagacity of sage and seer, scientist and sophist. The exasperating story was fruitlessly whispered adown the ages; hopelessly echoed from one generation to another. It worried the wisdom of Plato and the genius of Aristotle. It was discussed to no purpose in the porches of the Stoics, and pondered in vain in the groves of the Peripatetics. It was the burden of the daily question, "What is new?" asked by the Sophists, and was the ultimate aim of all the musings of Socrates. Grecian philosophy had done its all, but it accomplished nothing. As well might Athenian eloquence have made the attempt with its fire, Attic wit by its satire, or Spartan bravery with the sword. Cato and Cicero could

add little to the answer of Plato and Aristotle, and all the ancient civilizations left it precisely as they found it. Chaldean wealth was powerless to bribe nature into a disclosure of her secret, and Medo-Persian splendors could open up no avenue which led to the truth. It was puzzle alike to the wisdom of the Egyptian seer and the craft of the Babylonian Magi, and Orientalists seem to-day to search in vain for a satisfactory answer in the Vedas of Gotama Buddha, or the Zend-Avesta of Zoroaster. And if we carry the question from ancient to modern civilization the results are no more encouraging; the difficulty is as great in the days of a Tudor, or a Stuart, or a Bourbon dynasty, as under a dynasty of Cæsars, or Pharaohs, or Ptolemies. The difficulty has not abated one jot or tittle in the hands of Bacon, Kant, or Leibnitz. Not one iota of information has been vouchsafed in reply to all the questions that have been asked by the philosophers from Democritus to Darwin. The portals which guard the mystery are closed against the learning of the savants as well as against the wondering curiosity of the savage; and it makes little difference whether, when in quest of the solution, we knock at the door of a laboratory, or consult a Roman augur, or kneel at the shrine of the oracle of Delphi. The same result everywhere awaits us. The answer defies all time and dares all scrutiny. "There," says Emerson, "sits the Sphinx at the roadside, and from age to age, as each prophet comes by, he tries his fortune at reading her riddle."

And the solution of this problem was precisely the knowledge for which the ages longed. Never did patriarch sigh or prophet yearn more ardently for the long-expected Messiah than did the patriarchs and prophets of unbelieving ages long for the answer to their vain inquiries. The response would be the *Nunc dimittis* of all their prayers, anxieties, and hopes. It was the one single grain of knowledge which could impart a savor to all their knowledge, and without it all else was sure in time to grow insipid and lose all its freshness. Man had set his heart on obtaining this, and like a wilful child would rest satisfied with no other. Unless when they proved to be of practical utility all the productions of the arts and sciences were only so many toys and gewgaws, sure, in time, to be relegated to the store-room or the nursery. They might succeed for a time in diverting men's minds from the fruitless quest, but when the novelty wore off men started up again in pursuit of their coveted object, and cried for the possession of it as loudly and lustily as before.

But we may question all the philosophers, we may search into all their philosophies, we may wade through all the cosmogonies of ancient mythology, we may wander through all the windings of Buddhism, Brahmanism, Confucianism, and Zoroastrianism, we may

investigate the schools of German metaphysicians, French psychologists, or English or Scotch physicists, we may ask New England transcendentalists, and modern mystics of every race and nation, tribe and tongue, whether an answer has been vouchsafed, a sign given. And they are forced to answer, that it has been simply an evil and adulterous nation asking for a sign, and no sign given in response but that which inspiration tells them of. They have found the question otherwise insoluble. The traces of its insolubility traverse all human thought; the imprint of failure is on every human philosophy. Indeed, the fact that men are to-day as earnestly seeking the answer as they were in the days of Socrates or Thales, renders entirely superfluous any systematic attempt to show that all past inquiries, made by philosophers, have been absolute failures. An examination of all the philosophies, profound or superficial, reasonable or absurd, is simply a journey around the base of an intellectual cone. In our circular route we proceed from one system to another simply to find that each system is an avenue leading from the base to the summit; that at the apex all the philosophical avenues meet in a common centre; that the centre is crowned with a citadel, whose walls are grim and darkling, whose towers are gloomy and repulsive, and from whose windows not one single ray of light ever emanates; that in this cold and silent, dark and frowning edifice are lodged the great mysteries of the universe, pre-eminent amongst them the mystery of man's destiny; that as we move from one system of philosophy to another, we find they are constructed for the sole purpose of forming a perspective from which to view it, or as a road to lead to it; that up these avenues intellectual armies have again and again marched to storm the citadel and rifle it of its secrets, and that in spite of all the attempts, in spite of the number and strength of the invaders, the grim old castle has stood for ages—through all the days of man's history—without a single breach in its walls, without a single color yielded to the assailants. They have come with boom of cannon and beat of drum to scale its walls and take it by storm; they have resorted to all the arts and stratagems of war; they have crept stealthily on tiptoe and peered through the chinks and crevices; they have kindled fagots around it, that the blaze of light should shine through its opaque windows; they have called with stentorian voice, and with every note of the human soul, with shriek of anguish, with cry of despair, with bemoaning pity, with vaunting boast and braggadocio, and no sound seemed capable of awakening the inhabitants from their sleep of the past. The grim old citadel surrendered not one of its treasured secrets.

But while no advancement had been made towards the solution of this problem, the world was all the while advancing onward in

other departments of knowledge, and it might very naturally be suspected that although schemes of philosophy had met with absolute defeat, that invention and physical discoveries would be crowned with success. Past history has been fruitful in invention, in art, in discovery. But the sum of all the arts, inventions, and discoveries could shed very little light on the problem which had failed intellectual philosophy. The inventions were important, the discoveries many, the varied achievements of art most admirable, but they were utterly powerless to fill the void in man's knowledge, or still the aching spirit of inquiry in man's breast for the long-sought answer. The discovery of the earth's rotundity was a great revolution in the history of human thought. It was an entire change in one of the principal phases of man's knowledge. The world had been all the while on a wrong tack, but was at last set right upon this point. It was one of those crises in man's knowledge when his hopes and expectations soar away into the regions of the visionary and chimerical. The barriers of human thought were levelled. Human feeling ran high. Speculation was rife. New-discovered kingdoms of thought were opened to the inquiring mind, and men supposed that the cunning promise, "ye shall be as Gods," was about to be realized, for had not the "tree of knowledge" poured into their laps its richest crop? Few could tell where would be the end of such a momentous beginning, and it would not be strange, in the revolution of knowledge, if some light should be thrown on the subject that lay so near to man's heart. But when the novelty of the discovery passed away, and the fever of human thought subsided, men began to realize that their condition was little bettered by the discovery. The knowledge, wonderful as it was, actually made little changes in man's lot. It added little to the happiness, and subtracted little from the miseries of the millions living upon it, whether they believed that the earth, which gave them food and shelter, was round or flat, in motion or at rest. It was, indeed, a vast quantity added to the existing sum of knowledge, but the masses were little happier in their knowledge than in their misknowledge, while the philosophers found in it no clue to the problem of philosophy.

Next in subjective importance was the discovery of a New World. "Land! Land!" was rung out from the mast-head of the Santa Maria with such a meaning and significance as it never before or since possessed. A New World undreamed of in the Old! What limit could be placed to human possibilities? The New World may be in possession of the secret which had so long agitated the Old. Other men, of another race, may possess the key to the mystery for which men longed so long in vain; and the problem of the Sphinx may, perhaps, be at last unriddled. A wider scope,

at least, is given to man's mind, a wider sphere to his thoughts, a wider horizon to his knowledge. If the New World be not in possession of the secret, it may be in possession of something that may lead to it. A comparison of knowledges and experiences of the Old and New Worlds may bring the desired solution. At least men could fly from the evils of the Old World and betake themselves to the New, and, perhaps, if they could not solve, they could at least forget in their new land the exasperating riddle of the Sphinx. But the New World had no new story to tell. Indeed it only helped to confirm the old superstition which men had long since contemptuously flung aside. The question only became, if possible, more confused. The same traditions, the same religious feelings, the same notions of a Deity, terribly distraught, it is true, but yet pointing to the same origin, only aggravated the chagrin and annoyance of those who might have set high store on the hopes from the New World. Human life in the New World very soon began to manifest a sameness with the type and pattern of the Old; the same wants, the same woes, the same hopes, the same fears, the same miseries; and but little light thrown on the question of man and his destiny. Large as the discovery was, it was not large enough to fill the void in man's knowledge, and the vagueness and uncertainty were as great and oppressive as before.

Among arts and inventions there is hardly one that can compare with the art of printing in its results upon mankind. It facilitated to a marvellous extent the diffusion of knowledge. It was the most powerful means the world has yet seen for emancipating the human family from illiteracy. It was knowledge made easy, not for one or two, but for the masses of mankind. The labor of a lifetime was compressed into the work of a few hours. The "best thoughts of the best minds" of all ages lay before us on the printed page. The fruits of the world's labor was harvested for us and garnered on our book-shelves. There was no necessity for travel in order to become acquainted with the world. We might not have the time, or the inclination, or the means for travel. But keener observers than ourselves had been around the world, and it would seem had travelled for our special benefit. They showed us the world in their books better than we could have seen it for ourselves. Our untrained eyes might have passed many important objects and left them unnoticed, but minds formed by nature and trained by art for observation in the various departments of knowledge had labored for us and left us their notes, each in his own proper sphere, and it is doubtful if we had spent a lifetime in travel whether we should arrive at such a knowledge of men and things as the art of letters brought us at our own fireside. The page glistened with living pictures from nature. Nature's weird and

wildest work stood visibly before us. Far-off countries and their inhabitants, with their odd customs, quaint manners, fantastic dress, laws, government, internal and external polity, their fasts, their feasts, their holidays, and saturnalia, all glowed in the page before us. There we saw the Vatican and the Coliseum, the plains of Palestine and the steppes of Russia, the dykes of Holland, the vineclad hills of France and Germany, the Alpine glaciers, and Switzerland with its avalanches of eternal snow, all lay at our feet like a never-ending panorama of ever-varying beauty. We could not, even if we would, have lived in every age of the world, but in every age men had been busy for us recording each age's deeds, and there lay before us in convenient size the outcome of all their aggregate labors; the stories of battles and sieges, the first growth and final overthrow of kingdoms, the rise and fall of dynasties, their warriors renowned for valor, their towns and cities, their international relations, their manufactures, their commerce, their wealth, their civilization, their science, their poetry, their arts; all lay within easy reach of us. The art of painting was summoned to the aid of printing, and the ancient cities rose one by one from their ruins. Temples sprang from their ashes to illumine the page of history. The ruins of Memphis rose before our view, the plains of Philippi rolled at our feet. The Venice of Henry Dandolo and Francis Foscari again sat by the shores of the Adriatic. We could see the spot where "mighty Cæsar fell." We could see the butchered innocents squirming and writhing at the feet of the horses of Herod's soldiers, or we could take our stand in the Athenian Acropolis and trace the sculptured wonders of Phidias in the crumbling ruins of the Propylæum and Parthenon.

But withal there was one story which the printed page did not tell, there was one lesson which it could not teach, one question for whose answer we might search in vain through illuminated tomes or quarto volumes; and it was precisely the knowledge for which the unbelieving world had all the while been anxiously longing, compared with which all other knowledge was insignificant, and for which men would be willing to part with all the rest. But the answer was not there. The printed page was silent as the book of nature. The printer's art had left the difficulty unsolved, and men weary of heart turned away from the printed page again to listen if perchance the tales of the "running brook" would divulge the secret, again to try to decipher it on "the leaves of trees," or gather it from the sermons which they found in stones. After centuries of luxuriating in the great art the mystery was as far from being unriddled as if Faust and Guttenberg had never existed, or Cadmus had never introduced the art of letters.

And so through all the arts and sciences. The old question was

viewed successively in the new light of each invention and discovery. The human mind turned wistfully to every further development. The lantern, newly trimmed with each further instalment of knowledge, was held up before the tantalizing problem. A flood of light was allowed to stream full upon its countenance, but the countenance refused to be illumined, the inflexible muscles never relaxed, the immobile features underwent no change. Amid all the searching scrutiny the sphinx-like countenance maintained the same stubborn stolidity, and to every anxious inquiry its only reply was the same passive, sightless, stony stare. The invention, or the discovery, or the art, or the special branch of science which happened to be the passing idol of the century and the object of universal homage and veneration, was always supposed to be the oracle from whose lips the solution of the problem would fall, but when men discovered that their idol was dumb he was flung aside and forgotten. When the enthusiasm died away and the feverish excitement was over, the art or discovery fell in popular favor, was discovered to have been overrated, or was entirely forgotten. Indeed the Lost Arts furnish a theme for the eloquence of the great New England abolitionist. The wonderful discoveries of the past might be justly compared with the effect of the vast rivers upon the ocean into which they empty themselves. The flood-tide of knowledge, which seemed to rise with each new discovery, threatened to change the face of the world. The various channels which have fed the sea of universal knowledge have from time to time become swollen to immense dimensions. An undiscovered fountain springing up in its bed, a new tributary forcing its course into the bed, a sudden melting of the ice-bound reservoirs in its course, will enlarge its bed and cause it to overflow its banks, but when it has emptied its waters into the great sea, when the superabundance has been distributed in well-proportioned measure over the surface of human thought, when an equilibrium is again attained, and the waters have adjusted themselves, after the commotion, to a proper level, the effect on the world's knowledge is almost as imperceptible as the effect of the swollen Amazon or Mississippi on the Atlantic, the advance of the high-water mark of science is barely discernible, while the advance towards the solution of the problem is as a point to infinity.

And thus through all the arts and sciences, through all the inventions and discoveries, through the hands of all the philosophers and astronomers, the question comes down to our own age wrapped in every single fold of its old-time mystery. That mystery it has preserved unscathed and intact. The problem of Plato is the puzzle of Darwin. The question that was ancient when the Egyptian pyramids were yet in their unquarried beds is for men the

question still, and flings down its challenge to the physicists and philosophers of the nineteenth century.

And in all justice, if not to their prudence at least to their courage, it must be confessed that they are nothing loath to accept the challenge. They cheerfully address themselves to the task in all faith and confidence, nothing doubting. They close their eyes and ears to the lesson which the failure of six thousand years reads them. They have already embarked in their enterprise. They are far out to sea. Their present position is the position of Columbus and his followers when they lost sight of land on their outward bound voyage. The last margin faded from view, and they realized to the full the measure of their hardihood. The scientists have lost sight of the old havens and anchorages. They are already on the shoreless sea without chart or compass for their guidance. What will be the result? Will they be more successful than the explorers in past ages?

It is not a very difficult task to compute their means and chances of success, and yet it is seldom done. A calculation sufficiently accurate of their advantages and obstacles is a very simple matter. Compared with any past age the advantages are all on the side of ours; the balance of hope is on the side of the scientists now at work. Surely, if there ever was in an age in the world's history in which it would not be hardihood to attempt the problem, that age is pre-eminently our own. We are on all points of knowledge vastly superior to the most enlightened of preceding generations. New thoughts are on the wing, new ideas are in the air, new wonders spring up on all sides around us. Physical research, chemical analysis, experimental philosophy, speculative science, observations in astronomy are carried to a pitch which a century ago was not dreamed of. The nineteenth century is already an octogenarian, and its eighty odd years have not been in vain. They bring with them the time-honored dowries of wisdom and knowledge. Its whitening locks are thick with honors. Its children have encircled its brows with an aureola of scientific glory. Indeed our century seems to have grown wise out of all proportion with any of its predecessors. The sum of knowledge goes on increasing from age to age, and we are the "heirs of all the ages." The accumulated knowledge of all the centuries is our inheritance. The outcome of the industry and research of generations now mouldering in the dust is our special bequest. Each outgoing century has left its deposit of thought as the ebbing tide leaves the shells on the shore, and these accretions have accumulated from age to age, and now this hoarded wealth of ages is ours. Knowledge has been classified and thought on many important subjects has been clarified, so that time and labor are in a great measure saved us.

We can come to the treasure-house of learning and obtain the precious metal purified from all alloy, its quality guaranteed by the legitimate impress stamped upon it. We find it already classified, and labelled ready for use.

This heritage of the past our age carefully husbanded. We have been no wasteful spendthrifts of our portion, we have not squandered it with lavish prodigality. Not even have we been censurable stewards, guilty of burying it in the earth lest it should escape us, but we have put it out to interest and gathered an increase a hundredfold. On our own account, too, we have been doing much, and the growth and accretion in the past is small compared with what we ourselves have acquired by our indomitable energy, keen insight, and untiring industry. Our age has to an extraordinary degree been fertile in invention and discovery, and successful in physical research. It has brought side by side distant countries first in time, next in thought, and last of all in sound. It has succeeded in conquering time and distance. It has increased the audibility of the human voice to a degree almost surpassing credibility. It has practically learned the art of increasing speed by diminishing friction. It has chained two worlds, —the old and the new,—together. It whispers its messages across trackless mountains and beneath unfathomable oceans. Physical science it has picked from the attitude of crawling infancy, trained it to a firm and steady gait, and has so developed it that its onward march resembles the swiftness of winged motion. We have robbed the thunderbolt of its deadly aim. We have discounted the fable of Prometheus, for we have snatched the lightning from the clouds, and made it perform for men the office of Mercury among the gods. Indeed so swift has been the rapidity of our advancement, that weak hearts grow faint, and weak heads grow giddy, and the pulses beat fast, and men from the very whirl with which they are borne onward, hold their breath, fearing lest the next curve may open into other regions of thought which will show past opinions to be mere day-dreams, and where the hopes and fears of all their old theologies will vanish forever. Our age is undoubtedly one of advancement. And with all the advantages of our superior knowledge, and with all the experience of past ages to guide us, with the new avenues opened up to thought, with the new mines of instruction daily opening beneath our feet, it were little wonder if the hopes of the sanguine scientist should run high, and he should expect soon to see the dawn of the day when he himself could triumphantly proclaim his *Eureka* to the world, that he had at last discovered the answer which had failed all the philosophers from Socrates to Spencer. And surely in this view of our wonderful progress there would seem to be good grounds to justify his hope.

But when this much is said of the advantages in favor of our inquiring age, all is, by no means, said. He who, relying on our present knowledge and our superior advantages, would undertake to solve the problem of man's destiny would make a fatal blunder. Our knowledge is indeed comparatively great, but it is infinitely inadequate to the task of solving the problem. He who undertakes to advance an infallible theory of man's destiny from his mere knowledge of nature must be sure that there is no hidden knowledge, no undiscovered principle in nature which can contradict his theory. Unless he is certain of this, his most decided dogmatism must be doubtful even to himself. He may guess, he may conjecture, he may make suppositions and speculations without number, but he can never be certain that a discovery will not one day be made which will scatter his pet theory to the winds. He cannot honestly offer to others as unalloyed truth, that about which he himself is uncertain, and must have his own misgivings; and these misgivings the speculative philosopher must have as long as even one single stratum of possible knowledge remains unearthed for him. Those who rashly undertake to solve the problem never take into consideration the overwhelming impossibilities of the task—what gigantic difficulties they must encounter in its accomplishment. And the first difficulty that lies in their path is the wretched exiguity of our knowledge of which we boast so much. Viewed from one side our progress seems really deserving of all eulogy, but there is a side from which it not only appears but is, in reality, inexpressibly small. Viewed from the plane of our past ignorance, we are filled with wonder and astonishment at its overwhelming greatness; viewed from the plane of yet undiscovered knowledge, we are overawed and confounded at its overwhelming insignificance. The only just and accurate view of our present position is that which makes it the middle term of a comparison. To view it absolutely would be erroneous and misleading. To view it in relation to our former ignorance would be more misleading still. The man of sound judgment who does not wish to be imposed upon by shams and delusions and high-sounding boasts, but who wishes to form an accurate estimate of his real advantage for contending with vexed problems, will be careful to compare his present knowledge, not only with his former ignorance, but also with his present ignorance. He will compare what he now actually and accurately knows, first indeed with what was unknown to him in the past, and secondly, with what is unknown to him at present, and which may or may not remain unknown to him in the future. We blindly close our eyes to the latter comparison while we express ourselves in periods glowing with rapture and eloquence about the former. We are at such an infinite dis-

tance from the one that it never enters into our calculations; we have just succeeded in pushing away from the other, and are merely in the freshness of our infant wonder at the difference in our positions. The sharply-defined outlines of the September moon's crescent has just appeared above the horizon. We are lost in admiration of the thin, threadlike, silvery rim shining in the purity of its harvest splendor, but we never cast a thought on the vast, solid section of the sphere equally beauteous and many times larger which lies concealed in the shade; and the portion of the disk of knowledge which lies concealed from view, and which is necessary to complete the sphere of possible knowledge, bears at least as great a proportion to our actual knowledge as the darkened portion of the new moon's disk bears to the illuminated one.

Even in the branches with which learned men claim an acquaintance their knowledge is very limited. Specialists in any given study are far from exhausting the special branch in which they excel, and even their best knowledge is far from accurate. It is for the most part maimed and halt. There are wide gaps in every field of knowledge. Hardly one chain is whole and unbroken, and where we find one unbroken it is sure to be incomplete. History is not always an oracle of truth. It is very often a prophet that speaks vain things—sometimes contrary, sometimes contradictory. The most profound historian finds it a difficult task to arrive at the grain of truth. The most stately arabesques are often dumb. The mouldy manuscripts of the antiquarian sorely try his patience and his skill. Archæology is at best but a doubtful witness. Ancient archives may give up their treasures of antiquity, and disembowelled pyramids relax their grasp on coveted hieroglyphs, but the disentombed records time has faded, the mutilated papyrus must be deciphered by conjecture. After rummaging for years among the rubbish of centuries the few fragments that reward one's labor are often of doubtful value, often speak to us in an unknown tongue. Color and race, and tribe and tongue, perplex the ethnologist at every step. Traditions complicate his task; and after a lifetime of labor he has accumulated very little knowledge on which to build a theory, and less on which he can build with safety, a true one. The experimental sciences are merely in their infancy, albeit in a thriving, healthful one. Chemistry has learned to measure and to weigh. Geology has chipped some fragments of knowledge from Silurian rocks. Astronomy has given us a mere glimpse of the worlds without number which dwarf ours, but the whole sum of our knowledge in any one branch of inquiry is the reverse of thorough or exhaustive, and the whole sum of our entire knowledge is a mere mass of fragments. But this is not all.

We have acquired the merest elementary knowledge of the world around us. We have just learned the mere alphabet of the knowledge of the universe. The few wretched scraps of elementary information which have been wrung from unwilling nature, the few scanty secrets that have been wrested from her reluctant lips, the few hints which she has vouchsafed to her devotees, and over which they make so great an ado, are the mere clippings from the vast cyclopædia of hidden knowledge, imprisoned in her mountains, imbedded in her rocks, concealed in her bosom,—nay, which lie in the light of the sun before us, but which we are too blind to even blunder upon. And in the light of the ignorance of all this it sounds like coldest irony or bitterest sarcasm to speak of puny attempts to solve profound problems.

If there be any one subject which furnishes man opportunities for full and accurate acquaintance with it it is man himself. And man's ignorance regarding himself is simply astounding. Aside from his destiny, which some consider a mystery, his nature abounds with all manner of mystery. His mind is too feeble to grasp the greatness of even his own littleness. A lifetime is too short for him to get acquainted with all his own powers. The mysterious walls and cells of the brain, thought and consciousness, the world of sleep and dreamland, the variety of dispositions and characters, extremes often meeting in the same individual, tears and laughter, the tribe of diseases and ills, mental, moral, and physical, his spirits now bubbling over with mirth and gayety and the next stricken with sorrow, now sick at heart, and feeling like Werther, that the only thing which makes life endurable is, "that this dungeon can be left when he likes," now buoyant and jubilant, and "ardent to see the light of this sun but one minute longer;" the mysterious entrance into life, the more mysterious passage from life to death, this extraordinary and incomprehensible union of matter and spirit, these two wills in endless conflict, and yet this freedom of will, the mind a constant battle-ground between good and evil, the ceaseless conflict that agitates our lives making them marvels of incongruity; doing the evil which we hate, neglecting the good which we love, in the midst of our best goodness seeking for evil; in the midst of our worst wickedness hungering after good; at one moment carefully shunning and the next coquetting with vice; these religious feelings that fill us with awe and solemn reverence; all have perplexed not only the author of "The Sorrows of Werther," but every genius that has gone before or come after him. Not even the mystery of his own being can the ingenuity of man unravel or modern thought analyze.

Man possesses not more than a half acquaintance with himself, and he need but step beyond the threshold of his own individual

nature when his difficulties are endlessly multiplied and his mind is infinitely mystified. Difficulties, and their name is legion, come trooping to the door of his study. The world teems with mysteries for him at every step. Countless ages will not be sufficient to exhaust the supply of its hidden knowledge. Countless myriads of nature's mysteries throng around us in our daily walks, and lie unsuspected at our very feet. The very insect that crawls in our path, the gnats that throng the sunbeam, the leaf upon which we look daily, may contain properties which man will never know, or even suspect to exist, uses of which he will dream, and pages of instruction which it will never be his lot to read. Every bird, beast, and shell is replete with unsolved problems. We do not understand the language of the lower animals. "We do not understand the note of the birds." We do not know the uses of more than a few plants, the corn, the vine, the apple, and potato, as Emerson remarks, perhaps not even a tithe of their uses. The animal world is a confusion of sounds, the mineral world is silent and passive as the tomb. The hidden wonders that lie in the womb of earth between its centre and surface no hand has uncovered. The only shaft to pierce their mysteries has been the sparkling fancy of Jules Verne. The boundless, restless, unfathomable ocean has never bared to man the secrets hidden beneath its waves, far beyond the reach of keel or diver. "The overhanging tent of dropping clouds," now smiling and beauteous with sunshine and azure and purple, now speckled with lazulite and tinted with gold, and again bellowing like a roaring monster eager for earth's destruction, and venting its wrath in whirlwind and earthquake upon a doomed world—all are deeply veiled in mystery for man.

Man is a mystery to himself. The "world that waits on him" has mysteries innumerable. Of nature he has the merest elementary knowledge. He is very little in advance of the savage, and, perchance, not many strides in advance of the irrational world in his acquaintance with its mysterious secrets. And when he has exhausted all the problems of his own earth, there is no occasion to sit down Alexander-like and pine for other worlds to conquer. Even then his task has not more than well begun. Indeed, the littleness of our knowledge of our own world is not so bewildering as the littleness of our own world, which is so great to us. Our fragmentary knowledge of our earth is humiliating and discouraging, and yet our earth is but a paltry speck in the vast system of the universe. The field of astronomy has bewildering marvels of distance and velocity. The countless orbs that roll in space, the measureless spheres that stretch away to the confines of space, the myriads of sparkling spheres that march with the unerring precision of an army, all leave man mute and confounded before them,

and at last human pride is forced to acknowledge its impotence; for once man's arrogance has no pretensions. "Deep yawning under deep, and galaxy balancing galaxy throughout absolute space." These are the marvels which strike man dumb, and fill his mind with speechless astonishment. It overmasters and bewilders us to think of the littleness of our knowledge, but that in the face of its littleness we should become intoxicated with its greatness is the strongest sign of mental imbecility. It is when man comes to those springs of thought, and allows his mind free scope to wander at will, that the utter folly of his pretensions come home to him with irresistible and convincing force. We arrange the universe by our penny wisdom. We measure the unexplored regions of absolute space by the yardstick of our knowledge. We scratch the earth's surface to the extent of a few rods and in one little corner of our narrow earth, and with the cunning *savoir faire* of a wandering gypsy, wisely and with grave solemnity utter sibylline prophecies regarding things we have never seen, and explain mysteries of whose meaning we are utterly ignorant. The very light that is in us is darkness. "What we know is a point to what we do not know," truthfully says one. "There are more things in heaven and earth than were ever dreamed of in our philosophy," with equal truth, says a second. "Astronomy oppresses us with the gulf of space; geology with the gulf of time; history and travel with a fable of vain existence," concludes a third; and withal our age betakes itself to swelling dithyrambics to chant the praises of our wisdom —little short of infinite.

It is not so much the vast disproportion between our present knowledge and our past ignorance, as the disproportion between what we know and what in all probability man will never know—the huge volumes that will ever be for man as sealed books—the stupendous worlds of mysterious wonders whose Columbus will ever remain unborn, the vast realms of thought whose trackless wastes the footsteps of their Humboldt, or their Livingston, will never press; the captive powers of the physical world which will never know a Newton, a Harvey, or a Watts, to rescue them from their Babylonian bondage;—these are the considerations which dwarf the greatness of our age, and render all its pompous struttings and strainings after greatness as ridiculous as the affectation of majesty by a race of pigmies.

With all our boasted progress our nineteenth-century enlightenment is but a feeble rushlight streaming out against the impenetrable darkness of blackest midnight. We raise our rushlight above our heads to fling light to the world, but above and around, and away beyond, pressing us on all sides, and stretching away into illimitable space is a pitchy midnight of Egyptian darkness, a cloud

so dense that it may be felt. The secrets will not issue from this dark womb of night. The hand of all our wisdom cannot charm them to our light, and we are struck not so much with the failure of our feeble flickering knowledge as with the unfathomable world of impenetrable darkness which our rushlight is powerless to illumine.

And it requires no very subtle or acute powers of reasoning to see that this darkness must be pierced before the scientists can construct this human synthesis. It is very easy to see that before man can, of himself and without any foreign aid, hold up a *true theory* of his relations with the universe, he must be well acquainted with the universe between which and himself he would trace accurate relations. To build up a theory which would have any pretensions at all to truth on the few simple facts that we know and the few meagre discoveries which we have made must be an act of blindest folly. To pronounce a final decision based solely on our knowledge, to pass an irrevocable sentence which will be so comprehensive in its truth, so conclusive in its evidence, that from it there would be no appeal; so accurate in its calculations and comparisons, that it must justly claim for itself all immunity from error, requires a full, thorough and accurate acquaintance with the great truths of the universe, or at least with all the great principles which exist within and without it. We must first have drained the fountains of knowledge to such an extent that we can say without doubt or misgiving, and even with perfect truth, that no secret remains behind undiscovered which will conflict with our theory. As long as we cannot do this we are simply building on sand. But that from the niggard knowledge which they possess, the scanty facts on which they can rely, scientific men should undertake to pronounce the final word on the great problem, or even at all attempt a new solution of it, is to create a doubt with regard to the depth of their admired intellects. Or if we wish to vindicate their intellects, it must needs be at the expense of their honesty of purpose. They attempt to work out a mathematical problem from insufficient data.

The positive scientists themselves are by no means blind to the full requirements for the task they undertake. They see as clearly as others that this fulness of knowledge is necessary. One of the most enthusiastic worshippers at the shrine of humanity, Mr. Frederic Harrison, while telling us that "the true relation of man to the universe is the relation proved by science," and that "the source and canon of man's duty is to be found in a true and full knowledge of human nature," also tells us that his human synthesis (in which this "relation of man to the universe," and this canon of man's duty is to be embodied) "calls for a real co-ordination of all

knowledge"—that is, all possible knowledge. In other words—to translate Mr. Harrison's thought from the positivist dialect to rude but plain English,—before man can say with even a slight shade of probability in favor of his assertion, whence he comes, or whither he goes, whether he is shadow or substance, reality or ideality, whether he is a child of God, or of a catarrhine ape; and before he can tell what is his duty towards himself, and his fellow-man; whether he must love or hate his neighbor, whether he must live at peace or at war with him, whether he shall strip him of his goods when it is for his own profit, whether he shall rifle him of his good name, whether he shall give eye for eye and tooth for tooth, or imbue his hands in the blood of his brother for even the slightest cause; before he can know whether these and many other kindred things are or are not his duty, he must wait until science tells him. And this, science cannot tell him until it will have first drained the universe of all its wisdom and knowledge. Science must first discover its knowledge, according to Mr. Harrison, and when it will have left nothing hidden which has not been revealed, nothing in the entire universe undiscovered, it must collate and compare and co-ordain all this knowledge, decide man's relation to the universe, tell him whether he is appearance or substance, read to him the canon of his duty—and man then bows before the final decree.

We by no means quarrel with Mr. Harrison when he tells us that this real co-ordination of all knowledge would give us truth; because true science will surely right itself at last, and when the depths of the universe are disclosed they will undoubtedly coincide with the plain duty of man, but it is hardly just in the positivists to ask man to wait until the depths of knowledge are all sounded. The knowledge would come too late for all practical purposes for hundreds of future generations, to say nothing of the present or past ones. But just as surely as science fully developed and rightly understood, would give us the true answer, so surely would any system deduced from a partial, imperfect, or incomplete science be a mere hypothesis. The co-ordination of *all* knowledge is as it must needs be the fundamental dogma in the creed of positivism, but the distance which separates us from the attainment of this fulness of knowledge which is so requisite would pall the ardor of any but the most enthusiastic positivist. Here is Mr. Harrison's estimate of the distance. "The work before the intelligence of man is practically infinite; the materials and the possible fields of work are infinite; the relative strength of our intellect to cope with this work is small indeed. As Bacon said, subtlety of nature is ever beyond the subtlety of man. Ten thousand years of the brightest genius, with millions and millions of fellow-workmen, will not suffice to accomplish all that man needs of discovery, knowledge, method, ex-

periment, meditation, recorded observation, to make life all that it might and ought to be. [In other words, to arrive at this all-necessary 'all knowledge.'] To accomplish it needs the complex organization of an army, the discipline, co-operation, patience, division of labor of a great government."

Mr. Harrison has grasped so well the greatness of the difficulty that impedes the task of the scientists, that it seems a thousand pities he could not see the utter folly of attempting the hopelessly impossible task itself. If the true relation of man to the universe is the "relation proved by science," and if the work before science is practically infinite, when, in the name of all the scientists, may man expect science to tell him what that "true relation to the universe may be?" If the "subtlety of nature" ever outstrips the subtlety of man, and if we must possess a full knowledge of nature before we can have a co-ordination of it, and so a true human synthesis, Mr. Harrison and his associates must, in seeking their synthesis, be pursuing an *ignis fatuus* or a rainbow. If it requires ten thousand years of the brightest genius, and a whole host of indispensable accessories, which it will probably never have, before we can arrive at a knowledge of the "source and canon of man's duty," surely the present scientific generation must seek elsewhere than in science for an account of its origin and destiny and a canon of its duty. In a word, if it requires the complex organization of an army, the discipline of a great government and an infinite string of refractory *et ceteras*, before the scientists can tell man the true story of his origin and destiny, science were much better employed in recruiting its army and establishing its government, than in trying to convince man that his origin and destiny were not from God and to God, but that his genealogy lay in the right line of succession to an æsthetic ape. Indeed, if the "task before the intelligence of man is practically infinite (as Mr. Harrison rightly conjectures it to be), and if the materials and possible fields of work are infinite," also, as practically they are, it is high time that scientists who seek for a true answer to the problem of human destiny should abandon the fields of science and betake themselves to others where they will be greeted with better prospects of success.

The comparative insignificance of our acquired knowledge, and the necessity of a full and exhaustive acquaintance with all possible knowledge, combined with the fact that in all probability we shall never arrive at the end, is the first obstacle which meets science in the solution of the problem of human destiny. But it is by no means the only or the greatest one.

Another, and a greater difficulty, would be met with in the utter inadequacy of the human mind to wield the giant mass of knowledge. Even though we had drained the fountains of all possible

knowledge, even though we had surprised nature into a betrayal of the last of her secrets; though every mineral told in simple language its own history, and on every herb and leaf was inscribed the story of its powers, though all the complicated mysteries of the physical world were disentangled, even to the greatest simplicity; though the earth should unbosom to us all her secrets, the sea disentomb her wonders, and the numbered stars should become as mirrors in which we could scan their nature, and read their history; even though the valleys of learning should be filled, and the hills levelled; the crooked ways made straight, and the rough plane and easy of travel, the mystery of man's destiny would yet be very far from a solution. Given all this knowledge, but given nothing more, the problem would yet be a puzzle to the disciples of science. The world would be sorely tried to find the master-mind that could victoriously wrestle with the problem. It sorely presses a century to produce a Newton or a Shakespeare. Many centuries are entirely barren of great intellects; and not all the intellects of all the Shakespeares, Goethes, Platos, Aristotles, or Bacons that ever lived, concentrated into one common focus, and intensified a thousand times, could comprehend and control the vast and varied knowledge of the universe in all its extent and variety. To grasp it all would require a power of mind little short of infinite. But to grasp and comprehend each separate study would not be sufficient. It would be necessary to adjust, to collate, to compare, to weigh, to judge, to pass sentence, to rule with the mastery of intelligence in every region of knowledge, the depths of the sea, and the bowels of the earth, the heights of mid-air, and the higher heights of heaven, the ages of geology, and the marvels of astronomy, to interpret the language of the animal world, to understand the dumb alphabet of the inanimate, to hold evenly the balance of judgment so as to harmonize differences, to nicely discriminate and accurately compare, to reconcile antagonisms, to account for anomalies, to adjust incongruities; to hold the cables from every region of thought and knowledge in the hollow of his hand, and manipulate them with the ease and dexterity of a master. And this is not within the feeble capacity of one single man, whether he be a Huxley or a Hegel, a Darwin or a Herbert Spencer, or the intellectual wealth of all these and the rest of the world combined in one gigantic mind. To do so now with our limited knowledge is an impossible task, and the difficulty of the task would be multiplied a million-fold when our present knowledge came to be enlarged to the boundaries of all possible knowledge. To lay side by side, in parallel lines, these differently attuned threads; to reduce the whole motley mass, so interwoven and complicated, into order and harmony; to look along each

until we can see its farthest terminus firmly anchored fast in truth coming to us without break or flaw, sound and true; to adjust all these strings in perfect harmony, and from out their union and construction bring forth the keynote of the welcome chant,—this is the task beset with difficulty. Man's life is too short, man's mind is too narrow, man's intellect too feeble, the mass of objects too overpoweringly great, the number and variety of studies too many, the means of knowledge too limited, the subjects too vast and too profound. One single misstep at the point of intersection in the lines of knowledge, may send him careering millions of miles from the truth, even if he had once mastered each line of knowledge. But this mastery is a simple impossibility.

The most gigantic intellect which the world has ever seen would find it an utter impossibility to grasp even the small sum of the fragmentary knowledge of which the world is now in possession.

The experimentalist may display skill in his laboratory, but he is not always a profound historian, or a subtle metaphysician. The profound historian very often knows little of the laws of light, and heat, and sound. The most accurate astronomer may study the heavens, and often does so to the exclusion of the study of earth. Specialists are, for the most, proficient only in their specialty. The various branches of learning are as widely different as the occupations of the brewer, the baker, and the candlestick maker, and the savant in one branch may often know as little of the others as the candlestick maker knows about the craft of his brethren of the hops or the dough. The highest aspiration of even the best genius is to obtain a perfection of knowledge in a few branches, and in the others be as well versed as may be, or as occasion permits, and that he does so simply yielding to necessity. It is all that his time or his powers give him a chance to compass. The homeliest of all proverbs is as true as any of them, "a jack-of-all-trades is master of none," and it is eminently true in matters of intellect.

> "Our own (age)
> Is too vast and too complex for one man alone
> To embody its purpose and hold it shut close
> In the palm of his hand."

The grasp of intellect is wanting, and even if from a co-ordination of all our present knowledge the answer to the problem of man's destiny were deducible, the master-mind to work out the solution could not easily be found. If the world to-day should cast about for the mighty genius who alone was competent to undertake the task, it would be sure to turn to the ranks of the scientists; and if the scientists were asked to furnish from out their ranks this same genius, it is almost certain that all eyes would

turn to Mr. Herbert Spencer. In all likelihood, without one dissenting voice, he would be unanimously chosen as their noblest, their mightiest, and their best, as the one best fitted by natural talents, by education, by habits, by learning, by attainments in every branch of knowledge, for the successful accomplishment of the task. And, strange as it may appear, although the world has not appealed to the scientists, and though they have not been called upon to put forward Mr. Spencer as their representative genius, Mr. Spencer has, unasked and unsolicited, spontaneously undertaken the task of co-ordaining all our knowledge, and drawing his conclusions. Here, then, we have one whom the world regards as one of its guardian genii, one of its best intellects, if not the very best, undertaking the difficulty, and it is interesting to know what his success has been. We give an opinion of his success which cannot be suspected of injustice to Mr. Spencer or his work. Mr. Frederic Harrison, a stanch positivist, tells us that in working out his synthesis Mr. Spencer has accomplished his work "in many branches of science, the most notable things we miss being the facts of general history, of religion, of churches, of governments, of poetry, of arts." In other words, Mr. Spencer, in giving to the world his synthetic philosophy, gives us the play of Hamlet with Hamlet left out. He has undertaken to give a picture of the universe, true and real; he has set about determining the true relations of things to each other, and in doing so his narrow vision can see but a small part of the great whole, and matters of such importance as the facts of history, religion, etc., are unperceived by him. That he has failed, like all others who have preceded him, cannot be ascribed to him as a fault; that he should at all undertake the task is, as his work proves, folly. The wretched knowledge which the world can now boast of the human intellect is unable to control, how, then, grasp or master it if the cords were lengthened, the place of its tent enlarged, and the stakes lengthened to the limits of all possible knowledge? The narrow sphere of our knowledge and the narrower grasp of the human intellect, render every effort of our age to solve the problem of human destiny abortive; and any attempt by unaided reason in this direction can be only a masterpiece of human folly. Indeed, all this time we have simply been rudely elaborating the reasoning of St. Thomas regarding the necessity of revelation. The angelic doctor applies his reasoning to the knowledge of God, which, without the medium of divine revelation, could be attained, as he tells us, only by a few, and after long years of investigation; and the knowledge even thus acquired, he tells us, would be tainted with much error. But his reasoning applies with equal force to the question of man's destiny.

And the experience of the human mind verifies his reasoning. History has experimentally tested the truth of his argument, and proved it true in every instance. Reason has repeatedly attempted the task, and always with a different result. No age in which man has not attempted the solution, only to give to the world a new absurdity. There seems to be no conception so preposterous, no assumption so absurd that it has not given us. In religion it has given us the poles of human thought, in philosophy it has given us the extremes of human folly. It has endowed humanity with all the attributes of divinity, and it has clothed divinity with all the foibles and frailties of humanity. It has embroiled all the gods in the wars and tumults of men; it has made the love of men the object of the wranglings and jealousies of the gods. It has made Æneas and Romulus objects of veneration and admiration. It has made Jupiter and Juno objects of pity and contempt. It has given to us all the gods of pagan mythology, and all the Asuras and Pretas of Asiatic demonology. It has given us the fetichism of the savage, the polytheism of the polished Greeks and Romans, and the Voudooism of the South Sea Islanders. It has filled the world with all manner of abominations, under the name of religion, from that of the Sadducees to the Latter-day Saints. It has inundated the world with every species of foolery which fanaticism can conceive, and every speculation and delusion which can dupe the shallow mind. We have had the trickery of Trismegistus, the juggleries of Paracelsus, the stirpiculture of Father Noyes, and the prophecies of Mother Shipton, and thousands of such like stalking through the world in search of credulous followers to whom they may teach their end, and how to attain it.

Philosophy has fared not only no better than religion, but much worse. Any absurdity in the garb of a theory seems able to masquerade through the world and find disciples, provided it only pretend to offer a new explanation of the problems of the universe. We have had atheism, and deism, and pantheism, and materialism; and, like French cookery, we have had these prepared and served to us in many and multifarious modes, and over and over again. We have been taught that nothing exists save matter, and we have been taught again that everything is spirit. We have been told the world is a divine dream, and that heaven is a splendid delusion. A portion of the world seems, at one time, to have placed as much confidence in the fable of the three blind sisters spinning the world, as another portion of it to-day believes in the theory that man's ancestor was an ape.

The fruitless inquiry has given us the incomprehensible mysticism of Goethe and his English disciple, Carlyle, and the still more mystic transcendentalism of Emerson and his Concord fol-

lowers. It has given us the skepticism of Hume, and the idealism of Berkeley. It has given us the abstruse formula of German thought, and the gesticulation and fanfaronading of French fanaticism. It has given us monisms and dualisms without number. It has given the gnostic and the agnostic; the skeptical and the positive; the sensualistic and the material philosophies, as numerous and various as we have shades of religious thought and belief, the theories of one age, as has been truly said, often becoming the ridicule of the next. We are so accustomed to the language of absurdity on this head, that the language of sober logic would surprise us. It seems to open up fields of speculation where a man may pass a lifetime in uttering the language of folly, and yet pass for a Solon or a Solomon. It is said that a traveller who loses his path on a dark night will wander for hours and yet find himself only a few steps from his starting-point. The human mind has been wandering in darkness, and after centuries of wandering in a circle it finds itself again in the quagmires of Lucretius. Here would be the place to note the reasons of positivism for rejecting revelation and choosing the darkness rather than the light, but we have already occupied too much valuable space.

This much, at least, is evident to any one who gives a thought to the subject: that all the efforts of science in the past have been powerless to throw light on the enigma of man's life; and that in view of the difficulties that lie in the way of its accomplishment, little need be expected from all future efforts. Man must turn to some other source of information if he wishes to know the truth and meaning of his existence. Divine revelation alone can solve the problem. Not revelation as read by every man's whim. This would be false as science, and fickle as philosophy. The truth, the whole truth, is to be found in divine revelation, as interpreted by the Church of Christ.

THE SUPPOSED FALL OF HONORIUS AND HIS CONDEMNATION.

OCCASIONS for discussing the mooted points of Catholic teaching are never wanting. Objections of opponents a thousand times met and answered, are repeated by tyros and half-fledged controversialists with all the assurance of a first discovery and of infallible certainty. A very particular interest attaches to the case of Pope Honorius, so often cited against the doctrine of Papal infallibility, because it is the strongest case presented in the history of the Church, and to an unpracticed controversialist has the appearance of being unanswerable. The simple fact that this Pope was, after his death, condemned by a Council of the Church, and that the decree was sanctioned by another Pope, seems to stare us in the face and demand a satisfactory explanation. What, then, are the facts in reference to this interesting case?

The Synod of Ephesus had defined, in opposition to Nestorius, that in our Lord there is but one person; the Council of Chalcedon had defined, against Eutyches, that there are, in Christ, two natures. From these two definitions arose a new heresy, teaching that there is only one will in Christ and one operation. The followers of this opinion were called Monothelites.

Cyrus, Patriarch of Alexandria, in a solemn and public agreement which he made with the Egyptian heretics, in order to reconcile them to the Church, was the first to formulate the error. This he did in the VIIth chapter, in the following terms: "That this same Christ, one and the Son, performs both the actions which belong to him as God, and those which are human, by *one, sole, theandric operation.*" St. Sophronius, at that time a monk, and shortly after Patriarch of Jerusalem, implored Cyrus to abstain from the expression, "one sole theandric operation;" for if there were two natures in Christ, each perfect, it was necessary to acknowledge also two wills and two operations. To all the arguments, counsel and prayers of Sophronius, Cyrus remained inflexible. Sophronius thereupon had recourse to Sergius, Patriarch of Constantinople, in order that the latter might dissuade his friend Cyrus from his error. Sergius, who was more astute than Cyrus, though himself also a Monothelite, answered Sophronius that neither the word *one* will, nor the word *two* wills should be used; that these terms were new and would be a scandal to the faithful and an impediment to the conversion of heretics. Sophronius, however, repudiated this plan of silence. At this point he was chosen Patriarch. Sergius, fearful lest Sophronius, strengthened by his new dignity, should prove too

formidable an adversary to the Monothelites, sent letters to the Roman Pontiff, in which he defended the formula of Cyrus, and asked that his plan of silence should be approved by Honorius. To defend Cyrus's formula he used this argument: If there are in Christ two wills, one must be divine, willing the things that are divine; the other human, willing the things that are human.

But the human will, willing human things, may will sin; which is contrary to the divine will. There will, therefore, be in Christ two contrary wills. But it is absurd to admit two contrary wills in the one person of Christ; therefore it is absurd to say there are two wills. This epistle of Sergius is full of cunning, and written with the greatest apparent submission and deference. Honorius, in his answer, drew a very clear distinction between the *substance* of the doctrine concerning two wills in Christ, and the *formulas* by which that doctrine is expressed. As to the *substance* of the doctrine, he says that we must admit, in the one person of Christ, two perfect and entire natures, the divine nature operating divine actions, and the human nature operating human actions, each unconfused, distinct, not only operating, but the principle of its own operations (*operantes et operatrices*) in regard to those things which are proper to itself.

As to the *formula* by which this doctrine, entirely contrary to Monothelism, ought to be expressed, Honorius says, "You must confess, with us, one Christ our Lord, operating in either nature, divine or human actions (*in utrisque naturis divina vel humana operantem*").

Now this formula is directly opposed to that of Cyrus, who had not said, "operating divine OR human actions," distinctively and separately, but "operating divine *and* human actions," conjunctively and in a mixed manner, by one, sole operation, which was neither simply human nor simply divine, but always theandric,—that is, compounded of divine and human.

Honorius adds that the Church has always spoken thus, and so we ought to speak.

As to the question relative to this formula, as to the use, namely, of the words *one* or *two* he says, explicitly, that he does not wish to give a definition upon it, leaving it to the grammarians; he therefore approves Sergius's counsel in regard to silence, and confirms it by his own exhortations. But Sergius had defended the article of Cyrus's agreement in regard to the use of the word *one* (as for the word *theandric*, Sergius had prudently suppressed it in his appeal to Honorius). Honorius, therefore, expressly and solidly confutes both Sergius and Cyrus by this argument. According to the expression of Scripture, Christ assumed human flesh. Now, in human flesh there are two wills; one upright,

which is conformed to the divine will; the other vitiated and contrary to the divine will. Hence, in the Scriptures, flesh is taken in two senses; there is good flesh, which is conformed to the will of God, and vitiated flesh, which is contrary to the will of God. Now Christ did not assume these *two* wills of human nature; he assumed *one*,—the good will; because he did not assume human nature *vitiated*, but upright.

The preceding is an analysis of the epistle which Honorius wrote to Sergius. It is this epistle which gave rise to the whole question in regard to Honorius; for the heretics not only violated the rule of silence imposed upon them, but, through bad faith, distorting, to suit their own ends, the word *one* used by Honorius in speaking exclusively of the *human nature* of Christ, not of his person, they claimed Honorius as a Monothelite, and, resting on his authority, propagated their error.

The Catholics immediately took up the defence of Honorius. The Abbot John, who was scribe and secretary to Honorius, and who had written the letter, testified as follows: "We said that there is one will in the Lord, not of his divinity and humanity, but of his humanity solely." St. Maximus, Doctor, a "hammer" of the Monothelites, and afterwards martyred by them, asserted and proved that the writings of Honorius did not favor the Monothelites, and that his intention had been to maintain *one* will in the *human nature* of Christ, not in his person. John IV., who, after Severinus, succeeded Honorins in the Papal chair, wrote a defence of Honorius to the Emperor Constantine, in which he makes the same assertions that Maximus had made.

The Lateran Synod, convoked by St. Martin against the Monothelites, fifteen years after the date of Honorius's letter, condemned the Monophysites and anathematized them by name, without making any mention of Honorius; nay, it even asserted that all the Roman pontiffs had not, since the rise of the heresy, desisted from solicitude for the faith, writing to the erring, etc. The series of these pontiffs is as follows: Honorius I. (628), Severinus (640), John IV. (642), Theodore I. (649), St. Martin I., Pope St. Agatho, who convened the Sixth General Council, defended Honorius before the Fathers there assembled, and said that Honorius had exhorted the erring that, "*at least, by keeping silence, they should desist from the error of their doctrine.*"

Notwithstanding all this the Sixth Council burned the letters of Honorius, called Honorius himself a heretic, anathematized him after he had been dead for forty-two years, and this sentence of the Sixth Council was approved by Pope St. Leo II. and following Pontiffs, and was, moreover, approved and repeated by the Seventh and Eighth Councils.

From this series of events and the condemnation by the Council arise the following questions: What is the true sense of this condemnation? What argument can be derived from it against the infallibility of the Pope? And what against the orthodoxy of Honorius himself as a private person? We shall say a few words about each of these in order.

First: In what sense was Honorius condemned by the Council? Not as one who had asserted, taught, or propagated heresy, but as one negligent in his pastoral office, one who had favored *heretics* (not heresy), and had been overindulgent to Sergius.

Let it be observed, in the first place, that, from the first ages of the Church, the name heretic was applied, first, to those who taught or maintained error in good faith; secondly, to those who taught or maintained heretical doctrine, not only with a knowledge of their error, but also with pertinacity and obstinacy; and, lastly, to those who neither taught nor maintained error themselves, but were accessory to the pertinacity of heretics, whether by protecting them, by favoring them, or by not repressing them, if they were obliged to do so by their office; and it was said, moreover, that bishops were obliged to this repression by apostolic tradition and the discipline of the Holy Fathers. The first class of heretics that we have mentioned were not punished; the second and third were visited with equal penalties. What we have said is clearly evident from ecclesiastical history, from the discipline of the primitive Church, and from the Fathers.

Having premised these remarks we may proceed to our arguments.

I. Many were condemned by the Sixth Council; Sergius, Cyrus, Pyrrhus, Petrus, Paulus, Macarius, etc., and together with these, Honorius. Of all the rest we find it said, in the condemnatory clauses of the Council, that they had maintained one will in Christ; nowhere is this said of Honorius. Therefore it cannot be proved by the authority of the Council that Honorius taught one will in Christ.

II. In none of the Acts of the Council is it said that Honorius is called a heretic because he maintained or taught heresy.

III. It is said expressly, and not once only, that Honorius is condemned because, by his silence, he fostered the Monothelites and followed the counsel of Sergius. For example, Act. Conc. XIII., "We execrate the impious dogmas of these men, and we judge that their own names shall be cast forth from the Holy Church of God, that is to say, Sergius, Cyrus, Pyrrhus, Peter, and Paul, and also Theodore. . . . . And with these we order that Honorius be cast out and anathematized, *because* we find by the writings, made to Sergius, that in all things he followed his coun-

sel and confirmed his impious doctrines." The Latin has *sequi mentem ejus*, which is ambiguous, and may mean either to follow the *doctrine*, or follow the intention and plan of Sergius; but the original Greek text, of which the Latin is a translation, has, without any ambiguity, "followed the counsel."

Honorius, therefore, is not condemned like the rest for his impious dogmas, but because, by following the counsel of Sergius, he did not repress but strengthened (*confirmavit*) an impious dogma.

IV. It is expressly said in the Acts, that God cannot endure that rule of silence, "*Et quomodo non indignaretur Deus qui blasphemebatur et non defendebatur.*" "And how could God but be indignant, who was blasphemed and NOT defended?" (*In Sermo Prosphonetics*, Act. XVIII.) Hence, also, and for the same reason the Council is indignant, and hurls its anathema against Honorius.

V. The letters of Honorius were burned because they were destructive to the Church and favorable to the heretical contumacy of Sergius, not indeed, in doctrine, but in their approbation of the rule of silence and in too great lenity toward the heresiarch. They are condemned not because they *contained* the same impiety as the writings of the others, but because "*ad unam eandemque impietatem tenderent;*" they *tended* (in the Greek *concurred*) to one and the same impiety."

VI. If, therefore, Honorius is called a heretic, and is anathematized and cast out, it is not for heresy, but for connivance towards heretics. And expressly in this sense was the intention of the Council interpreted by the Emperor Constantine, who was not only present at the Council, but took part in it. In the same sense did St. Leo interpret it, who, having carefully examined the Acts of the Council and conferred with the legates who presided over it, approved them and translated them into Latin. Both Constantine and Leo say that Honorius was condemned, not because he taught error, but because he had favored and strengthened heretics, and had not stained the Church himself, but suffered it to be distained by others.

Second: What argument can be drawn from the condemnation of Honorius against the infallibility of the Pope?

The Catholic doctrine of infallibility is this: "When the Roman Pontiff speaks *ex cathedra*, that is, when, in the exercise of his office as Teacher of all Christians, he defines, by his apostolic authority, a doctrine of faith or morals, to be held by the Universal Church, he possesses, through the divine assistance promised to him in Blessed Peter, that infallibility which our Divine Redeemer willed that His Church should possess in defining doctrine concerning faith or morals; and therefore, such definitions

of the Roman Pontiff, of themselves, and not by reason of the consent of the Church, are immutable (*irreformabiles*)." *Council of the Vatican.*

In order, therefore, that the condemnation of Honorius should prove that the Popes did not always possess this infallibility, two things must be established. 1st. That Honorius, exercising his office of Pastor and Teacher, *defined* some doctrine to be held by the Universal Church. 2d. That this doctrine, thus defined, was heretical. But neither can be shown.

For 1st, in Honorius's letters there is no *definition.* In the first place, Honorius says that he does not wish to define anything, and he merely approves the plan of imposing silence; and he assigns no reason for this precept of silence except the fear of giving scandal and offence; and the simplicity of men, which are not motives for defining but for withholding a definition. In the second place, Honorius, in his letters, did only that which Sergius asked of him, and it was because he followed, in this way, the counsels of Sergius, that he was condemned. But Sergius had asked no definition, but only an approbation of the precept of silence. Therefore Honorius gave no sentence of definition, but only a precept of silence.

In the third place, Honorius said to Sergius, in his letter: "It does not behoove us to affirm *one* or *two* operations." "*Non nos oportet unam aut duas operationes predicare.*" But he could not, possibly, define that there was *neither* one nor two wills in Christ, because it is absolutely necessary that there should be *either* one or two. Therefore, Honorius defined nothing, but simply forbade that any should say one or two.

And, 2d, the Council condemned no heresy as having been maintained by Honorius.

In the first place, there was no heresy in Honorius's letters, as we have proved.

In the second place, the Council condemned him, not for heresy, but for connivance with heretics.

Third: What can be drawn from the condemnation, against the faith and uprightness of Honorius as a private person?

1st. That Honorius was not sound in the faith we have shown to be false. The Council did not condemn heresy as having been maintaind by Honorius. Therefore his orthodoxy is unquestionable.

2d. Honorius was condemned by the Council for a sin of omission in a most weighty matter which was destructive to the peace of the Church. This condemnation was "*in foro externo*," first, because, in Councils, it is external actions that are condemned, not the intentions of the conscience that are judged; and secondly,

because, forty-two years after the death of Honorius, no judgment could be passed, or was, in fact, passed, upon his intentions. This being premised, it is more than certain that the precept of silence imposed by Honorius and condemned "*in foro externo*" was, as to its objective nature, culpable in itself and in the highest degree pernicious to the Church. It merited, therefore, the condemnation which it received from the Council. But what shall we say of this same precept "*in foro conscientiæ;*" that is to say, in reference to the culpability of the act, not considered in itself, but in relation to the intentions of Honorius and the guilt which he thereby incurred, or did not incur, before God? Could Honorius, without any fault before God, have judged that, in those particular circumstances, silence was more opportune than the condemnation of error? Honorius was a Pope, not a prophet. His letter should not be judged by the effects which it produced, but by that which human prudence could suggest to him at the time. What then could human prudence suggest to him? We cannot, here, pass any sentence on this point. There are many Catholics who condemn Honorius; there are others who absolve him from all fault. Any one may believe what seems to him more probable. The Popes are not impeccable, but infallible, and this only when they *define*, with all solemnity, *ex cathedra*.

But it may be said that St. Leo II. asserts that Honorius, being departed, has been punished with eternal condemnation. Therefore, he asserts him to have sinned. We answer that the only possible sense to be attributed to these words is, that Honorius had committed an act, which, *in itself*, merited eternal condemnation. For, as to the *fact* of his perdition, a fact of this kind cannot be decided upon by the Church without most certain signs and miracles; because that fact is one which is hidden from human knowledge. It is true that in the canonization of saints, the Pope judges that eternal salvation has certainly been obtained by the saint canonized; but he judges from indubitable prodigies by which God confirms the arguments of human prudence.

We answer, in the second place, that this testimony of St. Leo would prove, not that Honorius was a heretic (for in that very same passage St. Leo says that Honorius was condemned, "because by his negligence he had fanned the flame of heretical dogma"), but that Honorius had sinned grievously, which opinion any one is free to hold who thinks he sees probable ground for it.

BOOK NOTICES.

De la Destruccion de Antiguedades Mexicanas atribuida a los Misioneros en general, y particularmente al Illmo. Sr. D. Fr. Juan de Zumarraga, Primer Obispo y Arzobispo de Mexico. Por Joaquin Garcia Icazbalceta. 8vo. Mexico, 1881. pp. 72.

This dissertation by a learned and diligent scholar in our neighboring republic is a masterpiece of calm, courteous, and thorough discussion, and controversy. Spain and Spanish America have been favorite themes for the historic school of England and America, rather than France, and a series of standard works paint the reigns of Ferdinand and Isabella, Charles V., and Philip II., as well as the struggle of the last monarch with the United Provinces, and the Conquest of Mexico and Peru. All these works are strongly biassed against the Catholic Church, ready to disparage the good she did, and exaggerate if not invent evil to lay to her charge. Some of the accusations made by Robertson, have been handed down, and under a pen as graceful and fanatical as Prescott's have in our century gone forth with a new impetus to pass as incontrovertible facts. "At the time of the arrival of the Spaniards," says Prescott, "great quantities of these manuscripts (Mexican picture-writing) were treasured up in the country. Numerous persons were employed in painting, and the dexterity of their operations excited the astonishment of the conquerors. Unfortunately this was mingled with other and unworthy feelings. The strange, unknown characters inscribed on them, excited suspicion. They were looked on as magic-scrolls; and were regarded in the same light with the idols and temples, as the symbols of a pestilent superstition that must be extirpated. The first archbishop of Mexico, Don Juan de Zumarraga,—a name that should be as immortal as that of Omar,—collected these paintings from every quarter, especially from Tezcuco, the most cultivated capital in Anahuac, and the great depository of the national archives. He then caused them to be piled up in 'a mountain heap,' as it is called by the Spanish writers themselves, in the market-place of Tlateloleo, and reduced them all to ashes! His great countryman, Archbishop Ximenes, had celebrated a similar *auto-da-fé* of Arabic manuscripts in Granada, some twenty years before. Never did fanaticism achieve two more signal triumphs than by the annihilation of so many curious monuments of human ingenuity and learning! The unlettered soldiers were not slow in imitating the example of their prelate. Every chart and volume which fell into their hands was wantonly destroyed, so that when the scholars of a later and more enlightened age anxiously sought to recover some of these memorials of civilization, nearly all had perished, and the few surviving were jealously hidden by the natives."

This is the charge as thousands have read it in his *Conquest of Mexico*. A similar view prevails even in Mexico, fostered by some who seek to dim the prestige of the Church. Sanchez recently, in his *Cuestion Historica*, reasserted it. A reply was made in *El Monitor Republicano*, which drew a second article from Senor Sanchez. Other scholars took part in the discussion, among others Senor Orozco y Berra, well known for his linguistic research. Senor Icazbalceta, in a dissertation forming part of his projected Life of Zumarraga, treats fully and searchingly "The destruction of Mexican Antiquities, attributed to the missionaries in

general, and especially to the Most Illustrious Fray Juan de Zumarraga, first bishop and archbishop of Mexico." He does his work thoroughly, quoting every author who alludes to the subject from the earliest period, adducing even some overlooked by his antagonists, so as to leave no room for future appeals. Pedro de Gante (1529); Bishop Zumarraga (1531); Motolinia (1536–40); Sahagun (1560–80), mention the destruction of idols. The last mentions the destruction of manuscripts by King Itzcoatls, and also by missionaries or in consequence of their teaching. Duran (1579–81) mentions destruction of manuscripts by some of the old missionaries; Acosta, in 1590, alludes to destruction by one missionary in Yucatan. Davila Pudella, in 1596, mentions the destruction of an idol by Bishop Zumarraga, and he is the first to connect his name with anything of the kind. Herrera (1549–1625) says many were destroyed by missionaries. Torquemada, in his *Monarquia Indrana*, published in 1615, says that the religious and Bishop Zumarraga burned the Histories of the lords of Azcapotzalco, with many other papers of great importance, and says that in the early days of the conversion certain books were burned. He is the first to accuse the bishop of destroying books. Ixtlilxochitl, a descendant of the kings of Tezcoco, ascribes the destruction of the idol of Tezcotzineo to the bishop. From this, Robertson makes the charge, "In obedience to an edict issued by Juan de Zumarraga, a Franciscan monk, the first bishop of Mexico, as many records of the ancient Mexican story as could be collected, were committed to the flames." And Prescott, as we have seen, expands and exaggerates.

Now all the authorities and the host which Senor Icazbalceta adduces to aid his antagonists, fail utterly to sustain Robertson and Prescott. "I do not deny," says Senor Icazbalceta, "that the missionaries destroyed temples, idols, and even manuscripts, as we know it by their own testimony. What I deny is that Bishop Zumarraga burned the archives of Tezcoco, heaped in form of a mountain, and pursued the manuscripts with a kind of rage. He may have destroyed some, but down to this time I cannot verify one single case; yet from an isolated act to a systematic persecution, to the almost complete destruction of the historical treasures of the Aztecs, to the blind fury attributed to him, of seeking out and destroying the manuscripts to the very last of them, the distance is immense." As the discussion went on, the violent terms applied to the bishop and missionaries, softened, and at last disappeared. The charges of fury, ignorance, and fanaticism were abandoned.

There is a sort of mock reverence for antiquity, yet, as Senor Icazbalceta notes, it did not prevent the Mexican liberals from giving the Protestants one of the most ancient and remarkable churches in the city of Mexico, or those Protestants from defacing and destroying all that made it a national monument. In our country it did not prevent the United States government through its agent, Governor Arny, from destroying the archives at Santa Fé and selling them for waste paper.

Senor Icazbalceta examines critically the later authors who, to exalt the ancient Mexicans, ascribe the destruction of historic picture-writings to the missionaries to account for their loss. He shows that the missionaries are the very men who studied this picture-writing, acquired the system, copied all they found of value, with explanations without which it would be almost impossible now to read the manuscripts with certainty. The missionaries adapted the system as a means of instruction and replaced the idolatrous forms by those of the faith they taught. So far from having been wholesale destroyers, these very slandered missionaries are those who have preserved for us these curious hieroglyphics, with the key to unravel them. Senor Icazbalceta shows

how a learned Mexican student, Ramirez, interpreted a figure of an animal and plant as recording a drought that withered even the maguay, or a prevailing epidemic. His interpretation was attacked by one of little experience who maintained that it represented the Viceroy Mendoza (*metl*, the maguey, and *toza*, a mole). A manuscript of an old missionary, giving the names of the viceroys and their symbols, proved that the smatterer was accurate. If a student, like Senor Ramirez, with the aid of what interpretations early missionaries have left us, could thus err, of what real service would the picture-writings be unexplained? You could prove from them that Eden was in America, or that St. Thomas preached here, or any other folly.

The amount of real historical information contained in the picture-writings is also examined, and brought from the region of vague generalities to that of positive fact.

No more valuable historical essay has recently appeared. It covers the whole ground fully and completely, and settles the whole question. The missionaries did not cause a wholesale destruction of manuscripts. Many were destroyed in civil wars, many perished during the campaigns of Cortez, and before their arrival. Bishop Zumarraga cannot be proved to have destroyed any, or issued any edict for the destruction of any. The heap of manuscripts destroyed by his order existed only in the imagination, and is utterly unsupported by contemporary authority. It is one of those stories that grow by general additions. The real Omars in the case are those who have unjustly given the good bishop's name to unmerited odium.

In Mexico no scholar worthy of the name will hereafter revive the slander. With us, unfortunately, it is stereotyped, and Prescott's work will continue to appear with the charge unaltered, with no apology, and no excuse, and continue to be read as history.

The calm dignity, the extensive research, and close reasoning of this essay give a high idea of the forthcoming life of Archbishop Zumarraga. It will be highly discreditable to us if that work, on its appearance in Mexico, is not translated and circulated here.

THE CAUSES AND AIMS OF IRISH AGITATION. By *M. F. Sullivan.* With an Introduction by *Thomas Power O'Connor, M. P.* J. C. McCurdy & Co., Philadelphia, Cincinnati, Chicago, St. Louis.

It is scarcely possible for the people of the United States to regard with indifference the agitation now going on in Ireland. A large part of our population is closely connected with the people of that country by ties of blood or affinity, and thousands of them are actively supporting the agitation both by moral and material means. To see a people numbering five millions, inhabiting a country possessing naturally all the requisites for material prosperity, yet sunk in poverty and almost indescribable misery; a people to a large extent illiterate, yet intellectually highly gifted, generous, virtuous, brave, whose native energy and talents push them forward and upward, in all the lands to which they migrate, to positions of eminence;—to see such a people persistently struggling against adverse forces, of long continuance and almost invincible power, to acquire industrial and political freedom, is a spectacle that can scarcely fail to arrest the attention and command the sympathy of the American people.

For these reasons, and because of the immense power which public opinion here exerts upon the people both of England and of Ireland, it

is important that the true nature of the Irish movement, its purposes and aims, and the underlying facts to which it owes its strength, should be clearly understood. It is all the more important, too, in view of the fact that constant efforts are made by the English correspondents of our leading newspapers, and by articles in English periodicals and journals republished in this country, to turn the current of public opinion against the people of Ireland and in favor of the policy of the English government. As is well and pertinently said by T. P. O'Connor, M. P., who has written the Introduction to the work we are noticing, "Unfortunately, much as has been written and is written daily on Irish subjects, the acquisition of the real merits of the case is far from easy. It is one of the disadvantages of the Irish people in this struggle that their history is told to the world by their enemies; for the English newspaper, or journal, or history is the authority which the mass of mankind accepts, or is obliged to accept. London publishes some of the greatest newspapers of the world. The *Times* has an international as well as a national circulation, while the Irish newspapers are rarely heard of out of Ireland, and are not known even by name by the majority of the English-speaking people. Thus, by a singular fatality, the press—in which, as a rule, all causes find hearing, if not advocacy—is closed to everything on the side of the Irish people, and—worse than this—closed to what seems open."

The purpose of the work before us is to counteract the effects of this one-sided and hostile presentation of the causes, nature, and aims of the Irish movement, by furnishing the information necessary to forming a correct opinion. In popular and attractive form it gives an account of the land laws of Ireland, the condition of the people, the oppressive burdens imposed upon them. It treats of evictions, "boycotting," agrarian crimes, manufactures, revolutionary movements, coercion laws, parliamentary history, education, etc., of the Irish people. Special attention is paid to the immediate causes of the formation of the Land League, its growth, operation, principles, and methods of action. It also contains brief biographical sketches of the leaders of the present agitation, obtained from authentic sources. In short, the work is a convenient manual of reliable information on all the subjects connected with the Irish question. It is a perfect storehouse of facts and figures; and they are so well arranged and so closely connected with the statements they are intended to prove and elucidate, that they are relieved of the dryness which usually attends statistics, and enhance the interest as well as the value of the work. Its comprehensiveness of scope may be inferred from the titles of its respective chapters, they are: "Ireland Prior to the Land War;" "How the People Lost the Land;" "The Reason Ireland has no Manufactures;" "How the People Lost their Parliament;" "A Lettered Nation Reduced by Force and Law to Illiteracy;" "The Irish Tenant of To-day;" "The Peasant Farmer in other Countries;" "Peculiar Features of Irish Landlordism;" "The Landlords Sow the Seed of the Land League;" "The Men who Gathered the Crop;" "A Peaceful and Constitutional Movement;" "A Landlord's Agent goes into the Dictionary ('Boycotting');" "Driven from Home by Famine and by Law;" "Liberty and Crime in Ireland;" "The Land Laws;" "What is the End to be?"

All these topics are treated and explained in a lucid and interesting manner, and in a way which closely connects them with the main purpose of the work. From those of more immediate interest we make a few condensed extracts or summarize the writer's statements. We turn first to the chapter, how the Irish people were made illiterate by force and English law. The subject is elucidated with an array of undeniable

facts and historical statements which prove, beyond all possibility even of doubt, that the blame and reproach implied in the charge of ignorance persistently brought against the Irish people cannot be fairly cast upon them:

"Within a century after the death of St. Patrick the Irish seminaries had so increased that most parts of Europe sent their children to be educated there, and drew thence their bishops and teachers. . . . . In the ninth century there were seven thousand students at the university of Armagh and the schools of Cashel. Dindaleathgloss and Lismore vied with it in renown. . . . . While the Gothic tempest was trampling down the classic civilization, Ireland providentially became the nursery of saints and of science. Her two most ardent passions were to learn and to teach. From Ireland, as from a fountain head, contemporaneous nations drew those streams of learning which afterwards overspread the Western World."

Nor was this passion for learning destroyed, as is generally supposed, even by the confusion and destruction produced by the invasions of the Danes, and subsequently by those of the English. It survived the adverse effects of continual war and almost total devastation of the country, the plundering and frequent demolition of monasteries, colleges and schools. "The *Annals of the Four Masters* are studded during the twelfth, thirteenth, fourteenth, and fifteenth centuries with a brilliant chronology of doctors, poets, and philosophers, as with saints and martyrs." It remained for the penal laws enacted by the English Government to destroy education in Ireland, though they did not and could not destroy the desire of the people to obtain it, as is proved by their persistent efforts to educate their children, notwithstanding the penalties they incurred. Of these penal laws a Protestant writer, Sigerson, says: "Over the heads of the bard, the schoolmaster, and the priest hung the sharp sword of the penal laws." Yet still the thirst for learning continued to exist, and "there were schools held in caves, in mountain glens and behind hedges, where forbidden knowledge was imparted by an outlaw master to illegal pupils, with a youthful sentinel posted on some neighboring eminence to give warning of the approach of the officers of the law. . . . . But if it was penal to look for education at home, it was doubly penal to seek for it abroad. . . . . It was a criminal offence for a Catholic father to send his child out of Ireland to school, and there were no schools left for him in Ireland." This state of things continued until fifty years ago. In 1832 four-fifths of the people of Ireland could neither read nor write. English law had reduced a nation to illiteracy. "Nor would it be fair," continues the author, "to say that if the privilege of learning has existed for fifty years this generation should be educated. Something more is required to make a people educated than leave to go to school. . . . . The parent must be so situated that he can spare the time of the child, buy it books, and clothe it presentably. The landlords extorted such enormous rents from the tenantry—who are, broadly speaking, all the people of Ireland—that the labor of the children was needed on the farms; and if that were not needed the parents were usually without the means to equip them for the schoolroom." Yet, "in spite of the extreme poverty of the country, and by sacrifices which must be deemed heroic, the people are acquiring education by using such advantages as they are allowed, and there are to day more than a million children in the schools, national and denominational."

Yet, even now, the Catholics of Ireland, comprising four-fifths of its population, remain subject to disabilities and unfair discriminations

through English legislation. To pass over other facts exemplifying this, it is sufficient to refer to the opportunities afforded in Ireland for obtaining a university education. The Catholic monastery of All-Hallows (including a Catholic college) was suppressed; and in 1591 its confiscated grounds were given to a Protestant educational institute, known as Trinity College, to which, until quite recent times, no Catholic could be admitted.

This College, expanded into the University of Dublin, continues, as it was previously, essentially Protestant. The Catholics of Ireland earnestly desire a Catholic University. They have founded one by voluntary contributions, but the English Government does not permit it to grant degrees, and the astounding fact stands forth that in the last quarter of the nineteenth century a Catholic cannot obtain a university degree, except by studying at an institution hostile to his faith, in a country of which four-fifths of the taxpayers who sustain the educational institutions are Catholics.

Ireland is a country without manufactures. There is water-power enough there to drive the machinery of the world. "That she has no extensive coal beds does not account for the absence of factories, because coals can be delivered in Dublin cheaper than in Manchester or London; and France, with her immense diversity of manufactures, has to import coal. The soil of Ireland is capable of producing, at a minimum of outlay, raw material which could profitably be manufactured for the home and foreign markets. Instead of devoting her energy in this direction we find that her one article of trade, in which she is relatively insignificant—the linen—is produced largely from imported flax, her own soil not being adapted to the cultivation of the best quality. She has nothing to sell except the food produced by her land. She has to send abroad, chiefly to England, for everything she buys. A country thus situated cannot be a prosperous country. A country in which there is but one means of living, and that one dependent on inexorable physical laws, must be a poor country, and must have periods of suffering."

The author shows that this was not always the condition of Ireland; that once she had manufactures; that her not having them now is not the fault of her people; that she lacks, manifestly, neither the aptitude nor the desire to engage in mechanical and other manufacturing occupations, and that the absence of manufactures from Ireland is owing entirely to the hostile legislation of England. This conclusion is proved by an array of facts which place its correctness beyond all doubt. The history of English legislation against Irish manufactures, as detailed by the author, is exceedingly interesting; and we commend it to those especially who wonder at the poverty of Ireland, and at the fact that her people are there engaged in no other occupation than that of farming. What the condition of the people who are thus shut up to the sole work of tilling the land is is well told in the chapter entitled "The Irish Tenant of To day." Passing over the history of England's oppression, fraud, and injustice, as graphically sketched in the chapters, "How the People Lost the Land," and "How the Parliament was Lost," the chapter describing the present situation of the Irish tenant is sufficient to convince every unprejudiced reader that the condition of the Irish tenant is an anomaly among all countries professing to be governed by the principles of Christian civilization; that it surpasses in hopelessness, misery, and absolute dependence upon the whims, caprices, and arbitrary pleasure of landlords the condition of the peasantry of any other European country. In proving this the author devotes a chapter to the description of "The Peasant Farmer in Other Countries," in which a summary is given

of their Land Laws and the legislative provisions made in those countries, during the last hundred years, intended to ameliorate the condition of the peasantry, and their influences in promoting the general interests and prosperity of the respective countries; all of which are reviewed in an interesting and able manner.

In the chapter which follows this the "Peculiar Features of Irish Landlordism" are sketched with a powerful hand; its cruelty, intense selfishness, its indifference to suffering; its extortionate exactions; the manner in which it crushes out thrift and energy, and imposes an actual penalty upon the tenant's improving either the land or his own condition.

To the great body of the people of the United States, whose reading about the Irish question has been almost necessarily confined to publications written from the English point of view, and who know Ireland only as thus represented, or rather misrepresented, we especially commend these chapters. We wish they could be brought to the attention of every one who is indifferent upon the Irish question, or has taken up the idea that it is an agitation that is causeless, or based only upon sentimental grievances. They would find in these chapters no rhetorical generalities or descriptions drawn from imagination, but facts gathered from sources of unquestionable reliability, and statements by persons of unimpeachable veracity, entirely disconnected from the Irish Land movement, revealing the true nature and effects of Irish landlordism, its grinding oppression, its exorbitant exactions, and the depths of squalid, hopeless poverty and misery to which it reduces Irish tenants, which require no appeals to feeling to fill every human mind with detestation of the Irish land system, and commiseration for those upon whom it has been imposed. These facts carry with them their own proof that prosperity is impossible in Ireland as long as this system is allowed to continue.

Following the chapters to which we have just been referring is a long and interesting account of the occurrences which led immediately to the formation of the Land League, the men who were its chief originators or foremost supporters; of the nature of the movement thus organized, the manner in which it is carried forward, and the manner, too, in which it has been opposed by the British Government. The coercion law lately put in force in Ireland; the arrest and imprisonment without allowing bail, or trial, before a jury, of Irish suspects; the shameful treatment to which Irish political prisoners are compelled to submit; the parliamentary strategy of the Land League members of the British Parliament; the real nature and object of boycotting; the circumstances which led to it; the peaceful and legal character of the Land League movement; and the results it has accomplished, are all well described and discussed. The subjects of emigration and of crime are elucidated by reliable statistics; and the real character and working of the Land Act of 1870, and of that recently enacted, are clearly shown. The last chapter is devoted to a discussion of "What the End is to be," and concludes with the statement, "The demands which are made now are two: Peasant Proprietary and Home Rule. History will yet record the day on which both shall have been obtained."

Scientific Culture, and Other Essays. By *Josiah Parsons Cooke*, Professor of Chemistry and Mineralogy in Harvard College. New York: D. Appleton & Co. 1881.

The essays which make up this volume were written, as we learn from the preface, at different times and on special occasions. They all are, however, connected with, and have a general bearing upon the subject of scientific culture.

The author may justly lay claim to possessing large experience in teaching physical science to college students, having given instruction in the experimental sciences at Cambridge for thirty years. As is naturally to be expected in the case of a person who devotes himself, if not entirely and exclusively, yet primarily and as his chief pursuit to one department of knowledge, he elevates physical science to a very high place in educational training, and claims for its special study a wider and deeper importance than most persons will concede. Yet still he avoids the mistake commonly made by devotees of the physical sciences of underrating classical and philosophical studies. To classical studies he certainly does not fail to attach due importance, as the following very truthful remarks clearly show:

"In our day there has risen a warm discussion as to the relative claims of the two kinds of culture, and attempts are made to create an antagonism between them; but all culture is the same in spirit. Its object is to awaken and strengthen the powers of the mind; for these, like the muscles of the body, are developed and rendered strong and active only by exercise; while, on the other hand, they may become atrophied from mere want of use. Science culture differs in its methods from the old classical culture, but it has the same spirit and the same object. You must not, therefore, expect me to advocate the former at the expense of the latter; for, although I have labored assiduously during a quarter of a century to establish the methods of science teaching which have now become general, I am far from believing that they are the only true modes of obtaining a liberal education. So far from this, if it were necessary to choose one of two systems, I should favor the classical; and why?"

"Language is the medium of thought, and cannot be separated from it. He who would think well must have a good command of language, and he who has the best command of language, I am almost tempted to say, will think the best. For this reason a certain amount of critical study of language is essential to every educated man, and such study is not likely to be gained except through the great ancient languages, the advocates of classical scholarship say cannot be gained. I am not ready to accept this dictum; but I most willingly concede that in the present state of our schools it is not likely to be gained."

"But, while I concede all this, I do not believe, on the other hand, that the classical is the only effective method of culture. . . . Yet, in abandoning the old-tried method, which is known to be good, for the new, you must be careful that you gain the advantages which the new offers; and you will not gain the new culture you seek unless you study science in the right way. In the classical departments the methods are so well established and have been so long tested by experience, that there can hardly be a wrong way. But in science there is not only a wrong way, but this wrong way is so easy and alluring that you will almost certainly stray into it unless you earnestly strive to keep out of it."

We have made these quotations for the purpose of showing the spirit with which Professor Cooke is animated in discussing the different subjects his essays treat of. It is in marked contrast with that of very many, we were going to say most, persons whose studies are chiefly or exclusively directed to physical science. The difference between Professor Cooke and these persons, in this respect, is one that is all-important and is entirely in his favor.

The "wrong method" which he has in his mind, is dependence on textbooks and acquiring a mechanical knowledge of facts. Both as a specimen of his opinions on this point, and because in expressing them

he clearly points out the weakness and silliness of the course of study persisted in, in spite of severe but entirely just criticism, by those who control our public school system, we quote a part of what he says on this point:

"To study the natural sciences merely as a collection of interesting facts which it is well for every educated man to know, seldom serves a useful purpose. The young mind becomes wearied with the details, and soon forgets what it has never more than half acquired. The lessons become an exercise of mere memory and of nothing more; and if, as is too frequently the case, an attempt is made to cram the half-formed mind in a single school-year with an epitome of half the natural sciences —natural philosophy, astronomy and chemistry, physiology, zoology, botany and mineralogy, following each other in rapid succession—these studies become a great evil, an actual nuisance, which I should be the first to vote to abate. The tone of mind is not only not improved but seriously impaired, and the best product is a superficial, smattering smartness, which is the crying evil, not only of our schools but of our country."

The following, too, is a strong statement, yet, perhaps, not too strong:

"In order that the (physical) sciences should be of value in our educational system, they must be taught more from things than books, and never from books without the things. They must be taught, also, by real living teachers, who are themselves interested in what they teach, are interested also in their pupils, and understand how to direct them aright. Above all, the teachers must see to it that their pupils study with the understanding and not with the memory, not permitting a single lesson to be recited, which is not thoroughly understood, taking the greatest care not to load the memory with any useless lumber, and eschewing merely memorized rules as they would deadly poison. The great difficulty against which the teachers of natural science have to contend in the colleges are the wretched treadmill habits the students bring with them from the schools. Allow our students to memorize their lessons, and they will appear respectably well, but you might as easily remove a mountain as to make many of them think."

But we have already exceeded the prescribed limits in our notice of this one lecture or essay, and pass from it with the single additional remark that it is replete throughout with valuable practical suggestions both to teachers and to students of the physical sciences.

The essay on "The Nobility of Knowledge" was delivered before "the Free Institute" at Worcester, Mass. In the truth, the elevation and comprehensiveness of its thoughts, it far transcends the average of discourses usually delivered before such institutions. A few sentences will serve to convey an idea of its ruling ideas:

"'Knowledge is power. Knowledge is wealth.' These trite maxims are sufficiently esteemed in our community, and need not be enforced by any one. . . . I desire to impress upon you the fact that knowledge has nobler fruits than these, and that the worth of your knowledge is to be measured not by the credits it will add to your account in the ledger or the position it may give you among men, but by the extent to which it educates your higher nature, and elevates you in the scale of manhood. . . . Nor is it the extent of the knowledge alone which ennobles, but much more the spirit and aim with which it is cultivated. . . . And let me add that what I have said is true not only of the individual, but also, and to an even higher degree, of the nation. . . . What can you expect in a nation whose highest ideal is the dollar, or what the dollar will buy, but venality, corruption, and ultimate ruin."

The author has no very exalted ideas of our "universities" (so called), or of the popular notions respecting them, and of what they are expected to do. He says:

"Our people for the most part look upon universities and other higher institutions of learning as merely schools for recruiting the learned professions, and estimate their efficiency solely by the amount of teaching work which they perform. But however important the teaching function of the university may be, I need not tell you that this is not its chief value to a community. The university should be the centre of scientific investigation and literary culture, the nursery of lofty aspirations and noble thoughts, and thus should become the soul of the higher life of the nation. For this, and for this chiefly, it should be sustained and honored, and no cost and no sacrifice can be too great which are required to maintain its efficiency; and its success should be measured by the amount of knowledge it produces rather than by the amount of instruction it imparts."

In the following remarks Professor Cooke points out one of the chief causes of the fact that our American so-called universities are lamentably deficient in literary and scientific, not to speak of philosophic, productiveness in comparison with those of the Old World:

"The deficiency," he says, "arises not from any want of proper aims in our scholars, but simply from the circumstance that our people do not sufficiently appreciate the value of the higher forms of literary and scientific work to bear the burden which the production necessarily entails. Scholars must live as well as other men, and in a style which is in harmony with their surroundings and cultivated tastes, and their best efforts cannot be devoted to the extension of knowledge unless they are relieved from anxiety in regard to their daily bread."

"In our colleges the professors are paid for teaching only, while in a foreign university the teaching is only secondary, and the professor is expected to announce in his lectures the results of his own study, and not the thoughts of other men. Until the whole status of the professors in our chief universities can be changed, very little original thought or investigation can be expected, and these institutions cannot become what they should be, the soul of the higher life of the nation."

The author's statements are unquestionably true, so far as they go; but they do not go far enough. Unfortunately, the professors and teachers of American colleges and universites are themselves very generally deeply imbued with the prevailing materialistic and skeptical spirit of the age, and this necessarily tends to narrow and dwarf their intellectuality, and shut out from their vision those higher realms of truth, which faith and earnest devout meditation upon its eternal realities would open to them. Truth is not valued now for the truth's own sake, as it was by the scholars and thinkers of the Middle Ages, well called "the Ages of Faith." Hence we look in vain now for "the divine passion for knowledge," for the exclusive devotion to its attainment and the profound far-reaching thought which characterized those ages, and produced of men who cared not for salaries, or refined surroundings, or for the gratification of cultivated tastes; who owned perhaps nothing but the coarse garments that covered them and a few books, intellectual giants whose lofty stature and immense strength the world is now incapable of correctly measuring or estimating.

The remainder of the volume before us is made up of "An Address upon the Elementary Teaching of the Physical Sciences," in which teachers will find many valuable suggestions as to methods and ways of arousing the attention and directing the thoughts of their pupils respect-

ing the facts and phenomena of the material world; of an essay on "the Radiometer as furnishing fresh evidence of a Molecular Universe," and "Memoirs of Thomas Graham and William Hallowes Miller."

Interwoven with the main subjects of these essays and memoirs are frequent references to Davy, Faraday, and many other ardent and successful students of physical science, their labors and methods of investigation, and the manner in which each step in discovery prepared the way for farther advances, etc. The volume throughout is replete with interesting statements and valuable suggestions, clearly and beautifully expressed.

SANCTUARY-BOYS. Illustrated Manual, embracing the Ceremonies of the Inferior Ministers at Low Mass, High Mass, Solemn High Mass, Vespers, Asperges, Benediction of the Blessed Sacrament, and Absolution for the Dead. By *Rev. James A. McCallen, S.S.* Published with the approval of His Grace, The Most Rev. Archbishop of Baltimore. Baltimore: John Murphy & Co. 1881.

We know of no work recently issued from the Catholic press which is likely to be more extensively useful than this truly excellent and practical *Manual*. The want of such a book to place in the hands of Sanctuary-boys, and aid the clergy in instructing and training them to discharge promptly and decorously the duties and functions they are appointed to perform, is generally acknowledged. The *Manual* is well calculated to supply this want. It is comprehensive in its scope; plain and exact in its directions. But to this, and to the character and contents of the work in detail, we shall refer more specially at the close of this notice.

The necessity of ceremonies in religious worship, and the importance of grace, order, and decorum in their performance, are so little understood, if understood at all, by non-Catholics, that we may be pardoned for making some general remarks upon these subjects before further noticing Father McCallen's work.

Religious ceremonies are a necessary concomitant of public religious services. As religion consists not merely of belief and sentiments interiorly cherished, but also of acts properly expressing them, it is essential to the very nature of worship as truthful and consistent that the act should correspond in form and character with that of which it is designed to be the outward manifestation. The requirements of human nature, too, demand this. It is a necessity of our nature that every deep and earnest sentiment of the soul should have an adequate form of expression. The feelings of affection and esteem which one individual cherishes for another, the loyal attachment of subjects or citizens for honored rulers, the love of parents for their children, and of children for their parents, all are unsatisfied unless they take outward shape in the form of actual manifestation. Nor are mere words sufficient. There must be some token given or act performed indicative of the interior feeling to satisfy and complete it.

Sound reason, therefore, teaches that God who created human nature, who gave to it its constituent elements, laws, and modes of action, and who established the relations which subsist between HIM and man, would make religion to conform in every respect to the divinely given nature of man; and, therefore, that the submission, the contrition, the sense of dependence, the gratitude for blessings received, the desire for divine forgiveness, favor, and help, the reverence, love, and adoration of man for God should all express themselves in suitable acts.

That these acts should not only be consistent with themselves as true symbols of their interior meaning, but should also have all the beauty,

grandeur, and solemnity possible for man to clothe them in, seems to us self-evident. No one in his senses would advocate as proper that subjects should express their loyalty to a secular prince in ill-conceived, awkward, or slovenly forms of speech and action. Still less can it be advocated or defended on grounds consistent with enlightened reason, or even the simplest common sense, when the being to whom homage is to be paid, is not an earthly potentate, but the supreme ruler of heaven and earth, the Lord of lords, and King of kings.

Therefore it is that ceremonies of some kind are inseparably and necessarily connected with religion under every form, in every nation, race, and tribe. We say inseparably and necessarily. For, as we have already remarked, *every* sentiment that finds lodgment in the human heart, whether of love or hate, of honor or contempt, of reverence or of irreverence, struggles to exhibit and express itself in the form of outward action; and only when it thus externalizes itself, may it be regarded as entire and complete. There have been religious fanatics who denied this, but in their efforts to give their denial force and to actualize it in their own worship, they have adopted ceremonies of the stiffest formality.

Nothing can be more rigidly, mechanically formal than the customs and manner of worship which the "Friends" have adopted for the professed purpose of excluding forms. And so it is with other sects who profess opposition to religious forms and aim at what they style purely spiritual worship. Their forms may be arbitrary, changing according to the whims and notions of preachers or people; they may be uncouth and irreverent, or the reverse, but forms of some kind there must be. Religious worship without forms through which it may express itself is as much an impossibility, and as much a self-contradiction in terms, as is the conception of a spoken language, capable of expressing the thoughts of intelligent beings, yet having neither vocal sounds nor words. Mere formality in worship results not from the existence of forms, their number or their fewness, their complexity or their simplicity, but from the absence in the forms themselves of true symbolical significance; or from the absence of real devotion on the part of worshippers.

It is not only not surprising, therefore, but simply what was to be expected that God, in revealing Himself to man, should also make known in what manner and with what ceremonial and symbolical acts He would be most acceptably worshipped. Consequently, along with the remnants of the primitive revelation which tradition has handed down are interlinked accounts of sacrifices and other outward acts through which man rendered homage and adoration to his Creator. In the revelation under the Mosaical dispensation, the proper ceremonies connected with each function and part of divine worship were prescribed with the utmost minuteness. Throughout all these ceremonies there is obviously not only perfect consistency between them as parts of a common system, but also consistency between the acts as external forms, and the truths and realities they symbolized. As God, too, is the source and author of all material grandeur and beauty, all that earth could furnish and human skill and art could form that was beautiful and grand, were made to contribute to the impressiveness and solemnity of the worship of God in the tabernacle and the temple.

The Christian dispensation is not only the completion and fulfilment of that of the Old Law, but also far transcends it. Hence, in perfect accordance with propriety and sound reason, as well as with the express injunction of St. Paul that all things pertaining to divine worship should be done with decency and order, and adhering to sacred tradition handed

down from Apostolic times the Church has always carefully prescribed that the most impressive and imposing ceremonies should attend the exhibition of the glorious truths and sublime mysteries of the faith, and the functions and offices of the service of the Sanctuary. To further this, all the resources of human taste, art, and skill, guided and inspired by true faith and profound devotion, have been brought into requisition, in order that in their grace and beauty, their majestic grandeur and decorous order, these solemn ceremonies might, as far as possible, suggest and image forth the worship of the Blessed in heaven.

Hence, not without reason, but rather with the deepest and strongest reasons, and for the double purpose of honoring God by a holy carefulness for decorum, and grace, and majesty, as symbols of Him who is the author of all that is decorous, graceful, and majestic in nature, and for exciting the deepest devotion and reverence in the hearts of the faithful, the Church has, from the earliest ages of Christianity, left nothing undone to secure the careful and decorous fulfilment of her sacred liturgy in all respects. By her Pontifical constitutions, by the acts of Councils, and by the decrees of Sacred Congregations, she has, from time to time, brought this subject to the attention of her clergy and bishops, and enjoined them not to neglect it. In her Missals, Rituals, and Ceremonials she has carefully laid down specific rules as regards every function and part of divine worship, and has made their strict observance obligatory. And because, especially in missionary countries and rural districts the number of ordained clerics is insufficient for all the minor offices and functions, she has directed and admonished the pastors of churches to call to their assistance virtuous and pious youths, and to instruct and carefully train them to the decorous performance of those minor offices and functions, so that in all things the services of the Church might be characterized by holy propriety, decorum, order, and solemnity.

Yet the work of training youths by means of merely verbal instructions, for the purpose of thus assisting in the Sanctuary, is both tedious and difficult. To lessen this difficulty the volume before us has been composed and published. Its object, as stated by its author in his preface, is "to lighten the labor of the Reverend Clergy by furnishing them with an easy and practical means of instructing those under their charge in the exact and worthy performance of these ceremonies. For this purpose, we have aimed at making the *Manual* a textbook, which, by the simplicity of its language, the fulness of details, and the number of plates illustrating and explaining the text, may be readily used by the young readers for which it is intended. . . . . We have endeavored to conform our teachings, on all points, to that of the Roman Ceremonial."

The comprehensiveness of the work may be inferred from the following brief summary of its contents: Chapter I. treats of the general dispositions and conduct of the Sanctuary-boys, of ceremonies common to all the Sanctuary-boys, and of directions for the use of the *Manual*. Then, in succeeding chapters, follow minute but plain instructions on ceremonies special to the Sanctuary-boys who assist at the divine offices, vested in cassock and surplice; ceremonies special to the Sanctuary-boys who serve at the altar, including vesting of the celebrant, manner of presenting the cup, cruets, incense-boat, and censer; manner of carrying the processional-cross, censer, incense-boat, candle-sticks, torches, and missal; incensing; and directions for aiding certain movements of the celebrant. Following these are special and minute instructions for serving at Low Mass, both on ordinary occasions and in presence of the Blessed Sacrament solemnly exposed; at the Low Mass of a bishop, at Low Mass in presence of a bishop, and at Low Mass for the dead; with like directions for the

Asperges before High Mass; for serving at High Mass on different occasions; in presence of the Blessed Sacrament exposed; at High Mass for the dead; at the Absolution for the dead after High Mass; at Vespers, and Benediction of the Blessed Sacrament; Asperges before Solemn High Mass; at Solemn High Mass; at Solemn High Mass before the Blessed Sacrament exposed; at Solemn High Mass in presence of the bishop, when the bishop in vested in cope, and when he is vested in cappa; ceremonies special to Solemn High Mass for the dead; and absolution for the dead after Solemn High Mass, when the body is present, and when the body is not present. To each chapter a series of questions is appended, by the aid of which the Sanctuary-boys may be examined in their knowledge of the matters treated, before being required to carry them out in practice. The value of the work and its easiness of comprehension are greatly increased by the number of illustrations, exceeding a hundred, showing the places to be occupied by the Sanctuary-boys at different parts of the Sacred Functions, their postures, etc.

The Reverend author of the *Manual* has brought to the task of preparing it the advantages of long and careful study of the subject and of large experience as Master of Ceremonies in the Cathedral of Baltimore. Nor has he relied solely upon his own learning and experience, but has availed himself also of the suggestions of a number of the Right Reverend and Reverend Clergy, both Regular and Secular, to whom he submitted the proof-sheets of his work for revision and correction before its publication.

Prefixed to the work is a warm letter of approval, from His Grace, the Most Rev. James Gibbons, Archbishop of Baltimore.

The Fathers of the Third Century. By *Rev. George A. Jackson.* New York: D. Appleton & Co. 1881.

This little volume is the second in chronological order of the series of "Early Christian Literature Primers," edited by Professor George P. Fisher, D D. It consists of extracts from the writings of Irenæus, Hippolytus, Clement of Alexandria, Origen, Gregory Thaumaturgus, and notices of Caius, Julius Africanus, Alexander of Jerusalem, Dyonisius of Alexandria, Archelaus, Alexander of Lycopolis, Methodius, Peter of Alexandria, Alexander of Alexandria, and other Greek writers; and so, too, extracts from the writings of Tertullian and Cyprian, and notices of Minucius Felix, Novatian, Arnobius, Lactantius, Commodianus, Victorinus, and Dionysius of Rome, Latin writers. The extracts and notices are necessarily brief, yet sufficiently full, particularly of Irenæus, Hippolytus, Clement of Alexandria, Origen, Tertullian, and Cyprian, to give the reader a fair idea of their styles of writing, subjects and methods of treating them.

The work in form and intention is not controversial, but purely historical and literary. It is clear, however, from the writer's thoughtful and concise introductory chapters to the Greek and Latin writers respectively, that he has a fixed and definite theory on the development of the Greek and Latin elements in the Church, and the influences they severally exerted. His theory merits notice and criticism because, while it is erroneous on a vital point, it is in some respects true and exceedingly plausible; it falls in, too, with the prevailing heretical theory of the growth of Christianity in the early ages of the Church. The error to which we refer influences the author's statements of the position of the writers whom he quotes and notices, but it comes to view most plainly

in his "Introduction" to the Latin writers. He there says that "with some qualifications the Patristic Church was Greek as the Primitive Church had been Jewish, and the Mediæval Church was to be Latin. Its unity, like that of the Greek nation, was federative; each church, like each of the Grecian states, was a little commonwealth. As the Greece which resisted the Persians was one, not by any imperial organization, but by common ideas and a common love of liberty, so the Church of the Fathers was one not by any organic connection, but by common thoughts and sympathies, above all by a common loyalty to Christ. Naturally the questions which agitated such a Church were those which concern the individual soul rather than society. Its members made much of their personal beliefs and speculative opinions; and so long as the old free spirit lasted, they allowed one another large freedom of thought, only requiring that common instinct of loyalty to Christ. Happily for the world, that free spirit did not die out from the East for at least two centuries after Paul had proclaimed the individual relationship of the soul to God. For, meantime, such thinkers as Justin, and Irenæus, and Hippolytus, and Clement, and, above all, Origen, within the Church, and the better minds of the Gnostics outside of the Church, had so shown the breadth and adaptations of Christian truth that, when the time came for the iron bands of mediæval Christianity to be broken, the world needed not to grope in the dark, but still found in Christianity a divine guidance."

"But already, before that paralysis of the Greek mind which doomed the East to a dead orthodoxy, a division was appearing in the Church of the Fathers. Though still predominantly Greek, its Western churches were beginning to assert something more than individual freedom. . . . The coming spirit was Roman. . . . Gradually the Latin elements assert themselves in the churches, and as the old Greek spirit ceases to act upon them from the East, the Roman spirit takes its place. . . . The genius of the Greek expressing itself in thought, of the Latin in ruling power, the Christianity which was to the former a body of truth, became to the latter a system of government. Since religions take on national traits by the influence upon them of leading minds who embody the national spirit, Christianity could assume a Latin type only as there appeared in the Church superior minds saturated with the Roman spirit. . . . Upon the foundation of a regard for law, the Roman state had reared a vast superstructure, which was now its most striking feature. Equally would Christianity, when once the legal foundations were laid, rear thereupon a political fabric, in time to become its most striking feature. To give this element there was needed, not the rude vigor and obscure position of a Tertullian, but the social leverage of the courtly habits and the administrative genius of a Cyprian. The chair of the Bishop of Carthage becomes to Cyprian not simply the seat of a pastor of a city; it is also the throne of the Christian proconsul, whose influence is felt to the bounds of the province. . . . But as no proconsul thought of his province as other than as part of a great whole, whose centre was on the banks of the Tiber, so Cyprian thought of the African Church as an integral part of the one universal Christian body; and to his Roman mind where else could be the centre of a world-wide power if not in Rome? Still, the bishop was as devoutly Christian as he was stanchly Roman, and for what he deems the proper church government he seeks an apostolic constitution. This he finds ('Treatise on the Unity of the Church') in the charge to Peter,—'I say unto thee that thou art Peter; and upon this rock I will build my church,' and in the common tradition that the Apostle thus honored was the first bishop

of the Church in Rome. As the successor of Peter, the bishop of the imperial city was to rank as *primus inter pares* with respect to all other bishops, and so as the head of the Church Catholic. In like manner the bishop of the governing city of a province was to be first among his Episcopal brethren."

Thus clearly and plausibly the author states his theory, and the prevailing rationalistic theory, of the growth and development of the government of the Church, and the origin of the Papacy. The trouble with the theory is that it is untrue, both theologically and historically. Its historical untruth consists not so much in misstatements of facts as of defective or erroneous explanations of them, their causes and relations. It is perfectly true, as the author says, that "St. Paul proclaimed the individual relationship of the soul to God;" but not, as the author implies, that this relationship exists and is maintained independently of the Church and its Sacraments. If there is anything clear about St. Paul, it is that he insisted not less strenuously upon the latter truth than upon the former; and, as regards the authority of the bishops over priests and of the Bishop of Rome as Supreme Pontiff of the Church, there is abundant proof that they existed from the very commencement of the Church and owed their existence not to the development of human thought, but to divine command and commission. We simply point out these errors of the author, as it would not comport with the limits of a book notice to disprove them in detail.

These errors, however, very slightly affect the critical and literary value of the volume. The quotations from the various works of the different Greek and Latin writers noticed in the work are made judiciously, and give a very fair idea of the spirit and genius of those writers, their leading thoughts, their modes of combating errors and defending and elucidating truths.

Poems by James Clarence Mangan, with a Biographical Introduction by John Mitchell. New York: P. M. Haverty. 1881.

The American public are deeply indebted to Mr. Haverty for this collection of the choicest productions of one of Ireland's most highly gifted poets, one whose name is a household word in many an Irish home, yet scarcely known and entirely unappreciated in England. Mr. Mitchell, the author of the admirable biographical and critical introduction prefixed to the poems, clearly explains why this is. He says that Mangan "was not only an Irishman, not only an Irish papist, not only an Irish papist rebel; but, through his whole literary life of twenty years, he never deigned to attorn to English criticism, never published a line in any English periodical or through any English bookseller, never seemed to be aware that there was a British public to please. He was a rebel politically, and a rebel intellectually,—a rebel with his whole heart and soul against the British spirit of the age. The consequence was sure, and not unexpected. Hardly anybody in England knew the name of such a person, and the only critique of his volumes, called 'German Anthology,' which I have ever met with, is a very short and contemptuous notice in the *Foreign Quarterly* for October, 1845."

On this issue is joined, and an appeal is made from English taste to American. "In the eyes of Americans," says Mangan's biographer, "*that* can hardly be a great crime (though to an Englishman it is the sin against the Holy Ghost), to ignore British opinion and despise equally British censure and applause. Moreover, I believe there is in these United States quite enough of the Celtic blood and warmth of tem-

perament, enough too of the true Celtic ear for melody, to recognize in the poems of Mangan that marvellous charm which makes him the household and heart-enshrined darling of many an Irish home. I have never yet met a cultivated Irishman or woman, of genuine Irish nature, who did not prize Mangan above all the poets that their island of song ever nursed. This one fact . . . . . makes it worth while surely to understand with what wand of power, and what musical incantations he wrought so wondrous a magic."

It would be interesting to follow the writer of the introduction in his graphic delineation of Mangan's sad and sorrowful life. But regard for the limits of this notice forbids. Suffice it to say that rarely have we read anything that moved us more deeply. Immersed in the deepest abyss of deepest poverty he struggled and labored on a miserable pittance, earned as copyist for a scrivener, to support a mother and a sister; subsequently he obtained a subordinate position in the Dublin University Library. He educated himself; how, or in what way, no one ever knew, into a thorough classical scholar; and of modern languages, besides the English, he was familiar with German, French, and Spanish, and roved at will through the glowing gardens of their poetic literature. It has been supposed that he also understood the Persian and Coptic languages, but his biographer says: "This is at least doubtful, and certainly his poems purporting to be translated from the Persian and the Coptic were altogether his own. Somebody asked him why he gave credit to Hafiz for such exquisite gems of his own poetry; because, he said, Hafiz paid better than Mangan, and any critic could see that they were only *half his*."

Yet all this time he was the slave of opium. He was jilted by a beautiful coquette, who laid her snares for him, flattered by the admiration of a genius who poured at her feet all the wealth of his imagination and affection, and then was coolly discarded. He was betrayed and deserted in his utmost hour of need by a false friend; and, in short, the storms of misfortune and sorrow seemed to pour down their utmost fury upon his defenceless head. He was in every respect naturally unfitted to battle with adversity. Silent, shy, reserved, companionless, shrinking even from those who from sympathy and pity forced their friendship upon him, his utter misery and desolation closely shut up in his own heart, his being was drowned in the blackest despair. Yet there was no bitterness in his spirit, no malignity, nor defiance, nor vengeful misanthropy; no revenge. He was always humble and affectionate, prayerful; and though sometimes for weeks bound in the torpor of the horrible drug to which he was a slave, yet "something," says his biographer, saved him from insanity and from suicide. "Perhaps it was religion," continues his biographer; "I am not aware that at this time he had any practical connection with his Church,—he was a Catholic,—but there was always present with him a devotional sentiment, and an humble, contrite heart. Before his death, too, he showed more profound interest in matters of faith, by more frequently translating Catholic hymns and paraphrasing the Sacred Scriptures." We add that during his last illness in Meath Hospital, where he lingered for several days, he was assiduously attended by Father Meehan, who knew and loved him; and he died while, at his own request, the penitential psalms were being read.

Contrary to our intention we have dwelt too long upon Clarence Mangan's sorrowful personal history to permit us to say much of his poems. A very large part of them is made up of, so-called, translations of the choicest gems of German and old Irish poetry. They are rather paraphrases, or reproductions, in which the thought and imagery are

amplified and enriched with the wealth of his own rich genius, and the rhythm improved by his own exquisite sense of melody and his power of versification. In deep, genuine pathos, truthfulness to nature, power of description, melodious rhythm, and wealth of imagery, Clarence Mangan has few equals. "Of his translations," his biographer says, "that though those of Longfellow and Bulwer are more literal, yet if Mangan's are once read, in fitting mood of mind, their melody haunts the ear, and the soft, dreamy beauty of the sumptuous robe which they sometimes throw around the dry bones of a ballad, harsh and meagre before, leads one to believe that if the German author could see himself so richly clothed, he would admit that in the account between him and his translator, the balance would be heavily in favor of the latter." A perusal of these translations will show, we think, that this is not too favorable an estimate. The translations of old Irish songs and ballads are usually those which are most sorrowful and pathetic, thus harmonizing perfectly with his own spirit. Among the most remarkable of these are his version of "O'Hussey's Ode to the Maguire," "The Lament of the Irish Princes," "Sarsfield," "Kinkora," and "Dark Rosaleen."

ORIGINAL, SHORT, AND PRACTICAL SERMONS FOR EVERY SUNDAY OF THE ECCLESIASTICAL YEAR. Three Sermons for Every Sunday. By F. X. Weninger, S. J., Doctor of Theology. Cincinnati: C. J. H. Lowen.

To the preparation of these discourses Rev. Father Weninger has brought the experience of over fifty years in the sacred ministry. His chief motive in composing and publishing them, as he states in his preface, was the thought that he "would do a good work in presenting to his brethren in the holy ministry a series of sermons, which, in twelve sections, would cover the whole field of ecclesiastical eloquence." The sermons for all the Sundays and Feasts of the ecclesiastical year—three for each Sunday and Feast—form the first two sections. The volume before us contains those merely for the Sundays. The next volume, we presume, will contain those for the Feasts. The Reverend author states that it was not his intention to present to the clergy sermons in the style of lectures. He believes that this would be of very little utility, being of the opinion of St. Francis de Sales that "nothing does more harm to the fruit of a sermon than tiresome length," and that, judging from his "long experience in the Old and New World, no sermons for Sundays and Feasts, delivered at *Mass*," should exceed twenty-five minutes in the time required to deliver them. He has further endeavored to so construct these discourses "that the preacher will find the subject announced in an original way and developed systematically, though each discourse is at the same time short and practical, not requiring for its distinct delivery more than twenty-five minutes. Nor are the discourses, notwithstanding their brevity, mere sketches, but thoroughly elaborated sermons."

On examination of the volume before us it appears that Father Weninger has been successful in carrying out his purposes as above stated. The sermons are direct, pointed, brief, and practical; and the chief divisions and thoughts are naturally and logically connected with the announced themes. They will furnish valuable assistance to the clergy in choosing and developing suitable subjects for the different Sundays of the entire ecclesiastical year.

THE HOLY SACRIFICE OF THE MASS. By the *Right Rev. Herbert Vaughan*, Bishop of Salford. P. Fox, 14 S. Fifth Street. 1881.

The death of our Lord and the Holy Mass are inseparably connected, the sacrifice of the cross and of the altar being absolutely identical in the Divine Officer and in the Victim offered. The Mass, therefore, is the great central act of worship in the universe, filling the entire creation of God with a homage, adoration, and thanksgiving of infinite value, while at the same time, like an abundant river flowing from Calvary, it pours forth over all who approach it with faith and devotion, pardon of sin, remission of temporal punishment, an immeasurable increase of grace, and all kinds of blessings, spiritual and temporal. St. Thomas and the theologians of the Church teach that a single Mass gives greater honor to the Blessed Trinity than the homage of all the angels and saints of heaven put together; and St. Bonaventure teaches that, as to the sanctification of souls, God confers on the world as great a benefit in each Mass as He did in the moment of the Incarnation.

It is enough to mention these truths of Catholic faith to realize the losses which are suffered through ignorance of the value of the Mass. Because of that ignorance, because they have never formed a correct conception of this Divine Sacrifice, how many, even among Catholics, are cold and indifferent; how many fail to avail themselves of the inestimable blessings they might obtain through it, and how many of those who assist at the offering of the Holy Sacrifice do so without the devotion and intelligent recollection which they ought to have, and which a true knowledge of what the Mass is would inspire and aid them in cherishing and exhibiting.

For the purpose of correcting this ignorance, and diffusing among Catholics a more lofty and a true idea of the Mass, the little work before us was written. Being written solely for Catholics it is not controversial, but exclusively practical and devotional. But devotion to be real and lasting must be based upon doctrine, and hence, as the Right Reverend author informs his readers in his preface, he has endeavored in simple language to lay before his readers the teaching of the Fathers of the Church, and of the great theologians Saint Thomas, Suarez, and Lessius, and Cardinals De Lugo, Bona, and Franzelin.

The purpose of the Right Reverend author of the work, as stated by himself, is not to explain "the prayers of the Mass, deep and beautiful as they are, and full of Scriptural allusion; nor the origin and profound significance of various sacrificial vestments; nor the meaning of the many sacred ceremonies which regulate the conduct of the priest and accompany the Sacrifice from the beginning to the end. The history of these things leads up to the Apostolic age, and there are so many books explaining them, and translations of the Missal are so common, that I need not touch upon them in the following pages. . . . . What I propose to do in this little book is to draw attention to the substance; to the very heart and soul of this great act of worship; to explain to you the nature and benefits of the Sacrifice, and how to assist at it."

In the prosecution of his purpose Bishop Vaughan shows what the Mass is; that it is not a mere form of prayer, but is essentially an act, and therefore "differs essentially from all other formularies of devotion, such as Morning or Night Prayers, Vespers, Rosary, and Benediction." He also shows how ignorance of this truth causes non-Catholics to make groundless and senseless objections to the ceremonial of the Mass, and how, too, the want of clear understanding of the distinction produces in many Catholics a want of that deep devotion which should inspire all who assist at offering up of the Mass. He then explains that it is an act of

sacrifice, shows that an external sacrifice has been regarded always, from the beginning of the world, as an essential part of divine worship, and explains in what sacrifice consists. He then explains in separate chapters "The Priesthood of Christ;" that "Jesus Christ is the Chief Priest of the Mass;" that He is "The Divine Victim of the Mass;" "The Identity of the Sacrifice of the Mass with the Sacrifice of Calvary;" and that "The Mass is the Great Central Act of Worship." He then speaks of "The Divine Perfections Manifested in the Mass;" "The Virtue Manifested by the Sacred Humanity in the Mass;" "The Holy Angels Assisting at Mass;" "The Four Great Ends of Sacrifice;" "Why Every Rational Creature should go to Mass;" "Why the Grateful should go to Mass;" "Why the Greatest Sinners should go to Mass;" "Why the Needy should go to Mass;" "Why the Sacrifice of the Mass is in the Form of Food;" "The Obligation to Hear Mass;" and what you must do when you cannot hear Mass. The Right Reverend writer then treats of High Mass and Parochial Mass; of "Modesty of Dress at Mass;" "Hearing Mass Daily;" of "Union with the Perpetual Sacrifice;" "Getting Masses said especially for the Souls in Purgatory;" "On Serving at Mass;" and "Various Methods of Hearing Mass."

As will be seen from this summary of the contents of the work it is very comprehensive in scope and the topics that are treated. Yet the statements and explanations are so direct, so concise, yet lucid, that they are comprised within the compass of a very small volume, forming a most excellent practical and devotional manual of instruction on the highest act of divine worship, the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass.

THE HOUSEHOLD LIBRARY OF CATHOLIC POETS, FROM CHAUCER TO THE PRESENT DAY (1350–1881). Edited by *Eliot Ryder*. Joseph A. Lyons: The University of Notre Dame. Notre Dame, Illinois. 1881.

Elevating and strengthening as is the influence which true faith exerts upon all the faculties of the soul, it could not be otherwise than that Catholics should enrich every department of literature with their contributions. Yet very few persons are aware of the greatness and value of these contributions. This is particularly the case with regard to poetry. Comparatively few persons can mention the names of a dozen Catholic poets. They may be familiar with their works, but they do not know them as Catholics. The cause of this is not difficult to find. The Reformation followed close upon the invention of printing, and all things pertaining to Catholic faith have been carefully withheld from the people. The various dictionaries and cyclopædias of literature, edited almost entirely by Protestants, and compiled for the non-Catholic market, have carefully concealed the religious faith of nearly all Catholic writers of eminence whom they mentioned, and have omitted mention of many others of equal or approximate eminence. Those who were not exceedingly well known to fame have been ignored altogether. Very few persons think of Chaucer, Spenser, or Dryden as Catholics, and if Pope's Catholicity is referred to it is probably with an assumption of surprise that "a papist" could have written so well.

It is important that this ignorance of what Catholics have done and are doing in the field of literature should be dispelled; that Catholics, at least, should know what the children of the true faith have accomplished in this respect; and that those who assume them to be lacking in either the power to produce or the capacity to appreciate should be shown their egregious error. Yet this is no easy task, owing to the extent and manner in which, as has already been remarked, the religious

belief of Catholic writers, particularly of Catholic poets, has been almost universally ignored, even where it has not been designedly concealed, in the most widely known and popular cyclopædias, and manuals, and dictionaries of literature. The compiler and editor of the work before us, as was to be expected under the circumstances, met with this difficulty. Referring to it he says: "It may be truly said that the researches required to ascertain who were and who were not Catholics has constituted the chief labor in preparing this volume."

The editor has not included selections from all Catholics who have written poetry. Several of the earlier English poets have been omitted because their productions figure but slightly in literature at the present day, and also because their language, long since obsolete, would be unintelligible to the average reader. Obvious reasons have led to other omissions. The necessity of preventing the volume assuming too large proportions has required him to confine his selections almost entirely to the lyrical productions of the poets represented in his work, and to select the briefest of their poems. In making these selections the editor has taken them from standard sources. The chronological method of arrangement has been adopted, as far as was possible, both for the sake of convenience and because it best afforded a general survey of the progress of Catholic contributions to poetic literature in connection with history.

We have thus dwelt *in extenso* upon the design of the work, its plan and scope, and upon the ideas which guided and controlled its editor in preparing it, because we desire to impress our readers with a sense of its merits. It is a valuable as well as an exceedingly attractive book. It comprises many of the finest productions of Catholic poetic genius, and, within the compass of a convenient volume, furnishes a fair and comprehensive view of what Catholics have done in the field of English poetry.

It would do the work injustice to dismiss it without referring to its external appearance and general typographical make-up. It is a truly beautiful volume, forming a fitting casket for the rich and brilliant gems of thought it contains. Its binding, presswork, and paper are all that good taste and an appreciation of the beautiful could desire.

THE ART OF THINKING WELL. By *Rev. James Balmes*, Author of Letters to a Skeptic, etc. Translated from the Spanish by Rev. William McDonald, D.D. Preceded by a Life of the Author. Dublin: M. H. Gill & Son. 1882.

Balmes is chiefly known in this country by his work contrasting the respective influences of the Catholic religion and of Protestantism upon civilization, and his "Fundamental Philosophy." Yet he was an indefatigable writer as well as a profound student. Nor were his studies and pursuits exclusively historical and philosophical. They included mathematics, law, medicine, and politics, so far at least as the latter were concerned with religion. He possessed both untiring industry and extraordinary intellectual talent. At the age of seventeen he was already considered a prodigy of learning, and was regarded by his professors, Drs. Barri, Caixal, Xarrie, Ricord, and Galli, with such respect, that they often prolonged their examinations beyond the fixed time, for the pleasure of hearing his clear and brilliant solutions. His subsequent career, which is sketched in the first part of the volume before us, showed that the bright promise of his early youth was not unfulfilled. But though his career was a brilliant one and his labors fruitful in writings which have exerted a widespread and deep influence, his years were few. In the thirty-eighth year of his age, in the city of Vich, after receiving the last sacraments of the Church, he peacefully passed from earth.

The treatise on "The Art of Thinking Well" is a lucid, logical, and practical exposition of the important subject with which it deals. After preliminary considerations of what it is "To Think Well," and "What is Truth," the author passes on to treat in successive chapters of Attention, Choice of a Profession, Questions of Possibility, Questions about Existence, Knowledge acquired by Immediate Testimony of the Senses, Knowledge of the Existence of Things acquired directly by the Senses, Logic in accord with Charity; on Human Authority, Newspapers, Books of Travel, History; General Considerations of the Means of Knowing the Nature, Properties, and Relations of Beings; Good Perception, Judgment, Reasoning; All is not done by Reasoning; Teaching, Invention; The Understanding, the Heart, and the Imagination; Philosophy of History; Religion; Practical Understanding.

These various subjects are philosophically, profoundly discussed. Yet the explication of them is so simple, direct, and lucid, and the examples illustrating the principles laid down are so happily chosen and stated, that the work may be understood and read with interest and profit by any person of ordinary intelligence and thoughtfulness.

The Prisoners of the King; Thoughts on the Catholic Doctrine of Purgatory. By *Henry James Coleridge*, of the Society of Jesus. A New Edition. London: Burns & Oates. 1882.

This work does not claim to be a systematic treatise on the doctrine of Purgatory with which it deals. It is rather a collection of reflections on the subject growing out of the spiritual significance and import of the miracles of our Divine Lord. For this very reason, we think, it is all the better adapted for general reading.

The Reverend Father explains in his preface how the thought of composing this volume and its plans and contents came to him. It occurred to him while preaching "during the Octave with which the Society of the Helpers of the Holy Souls is accustomed to celebrate the annual commemoration of the Faithful Departed" that "some of the miracles of our Lord might be usefully applied in illustration of the doctrine of Purgatory. . . . Our Lord's miracles were almost universally acts of mercy as well as acts of authority, and thus it is natural to find that they are full of teaching as to the various spiritual miseries of souls and His tenderness in succoring them. The Holy Souls are sufferers to a degree and in a manner which are but faintly pictured in the bodily maladies which our Lord so lovingly relieved, and they are sufferers whose case He has left very much to the charity of the children of the Militant Church. His Sacred Heart looked further than the outward disease or privation for which He used His healing or restoring power, and, if it is most natural to consider all bodily evils as shadows and images by which spiritual infirmities are represented, it is not any exaggerated extension of the same principle of accommodation to consider the sufferings of Purgatory, all of which are caused by sin or negligence, as included under it. And no phase or department of Christian devotion can ever lose by being connected in any way with considerations on the acts and sayings of our Lord."

Employing this principle of accommodation and following out the general thought expressed in the foregoing quotation, Father Coleridge beautifully and clearly sets forth his reflections upon Purgatory, the condition and sufferings of Holy Souls, the desire of our Lord that they should be speedily released, and the duties of Christians on earth towards them, suggested by and deduced from careful examination and study of the miracles of our Divine Lord.

SEVEN VOICES OF SYMPATHY, from the Writings of Henry Wadsworth Longfellow. Edited by Charlotte Fiske Bates. Boston: Houghton, Mifflin & Co. 1882.

The writings of Mr. Longfellow are so well known and so generally admired that a judicious selection can scarcely fail to secure acceptance from the American public. The editor of the volume before us at first undertook, at the suggestion of the late James T. Fields, the preparation of a collection from Longfellow's poems for the solace of bereavement. Subsequently, however, she changed the aim and extent of the work by selecting not only from his poems, but also from his prose writings. At the same time she expanded her plan so as to embrace extracts not only for those who were afflicted by the death of dear friends and relatives, but also "for the depressed, the neglected, the toiling, the erring, the struggling, and the aged." She has accordingly distributed her selections under the several heads of: I. Bereavement and Sorrow; II. Weakness, Struggle, and Aspiration; III. Labor and Endurance; IV. Restlessness, Doubt, and Darkness; V. Self-denial and Philanthropy; VI. Neglect, Disappointment, and Injustice; and VII. Retrospection and Old Age.

To these she also, with excellent judgment, has prefixed two others of Longfellow's poems: "The Author to his Readers," and "Auf Wiedersehen," being Mr. Longfellow's "Tribute in Memory of James T. Fields."

The collection has evidently been made with great care and judicious discrimination. It contains many of the happiest and most beautiful parts of Mr. Longfellow's writings, and will doubtless meet with a welcome reception from those to whom it is intended to convey sympathy and consolation.

A SURE WAY TO A HAPPY MARRIAGE: A Book of Instructions for those betrothed and for the married. From the German of Rev. Conrad Sickinger. By *Rev. Edward Ign. Taylor*, of St. Peter's Pro-Cathedral, Wilmington (Del.). New York, Cincinnati, and St. Louis: Berringer Brothers, Printers to the Holy Apostolic See.

In all ages there have been many unchristian marriages, but there has never been a time when in professedly Christian countries more such unchristian marriages take place than in our own age. Unfortunately, too, they are increasing from year to year. Their fruits are plainly visible everywhere in the domestic unhappiness and misery, the absence of true conjugal love and esteem, the prevalence of conjugal unfaithfulness, the disregard of parental and of filial obligations, and the growth of vice, immorality, and crime immediately connected with conjugal family relations. Marriage is a sacrament, and the relations and obligations it creates are of divine institution.

Where this great truth and the subsidiary truths connected with it are lost sight of or disregarded, the results that follow are as certain as they are lamentable. It was, therefore, a happy thought that led Father Taylor to translate into English this excellent and beautiful work of Father Sickinger. It is divided into three parts, treating respectively of virginity, betrothal, and marriage. Each of these parts in its various subdivisions, instructs the reader on the different subjects pertaining to them. It is a most interesting and excellent book—one which it would be well for the clergy to recommend to persons contemplating matrimony, and for parents to put into the hands of their children, and we may add, for them themselves to read.

THE ILLUSTRATED CATHOLIC FAMILY ANNUAL FOR 1882. With Calendars calculated for different Parallels of Latitude, and adapted for use throughout the United States. New York; The Catholic Publication Society Co.

This excellent Annual increases in the interest and variety of its matter with each year of its publication. The number for the present year, in addition to the usual secular and religious Calendar and astronomical calculations, contains a list of the Archbishops and Bishops of the Church in the United States, a number of valuable statistical tables, sketches and portraits of the characters, lives, and labors of many distinguished Catholic writers, founders of Religious Orders, Prelates and Saints; also engravings of ancient ruins, shrines, and churches. Among the most interesting of the sketches, we specially note the papers upon the Most Rev. F. N. Blanchet, D.D., who recently resigned his office of Archbishop of Oregon, at the advanced age of eighty-six years, after serving as bishop for thirty-six years, and as priest for sixty-two; upon St. Catharine of Sienna; Father Olier, Founder of the Sulpicians; Very Rev. Nicholas Dominic Young, O.S.D.; Very Rev. Canon Oakley; Kenelm Henry Digby; Catharine McAuley; Cardinal Breton; Herman Von Mallincrodt, Pauline Mallincrodt, Bertrand du Guesclin, and the great Spanish poet-priest, Rev. Pedro Calderon de la Barca.

The Annual also contains clear and explicit statements of the Days of Obligation to hear Mass and abstain from servile work in the different dioceses in the United States; of the Fasting Days of Obligation, and of the Abstinence Days.

LEAVES FROM THE ANNALS OF THE SISTERS OF MERCY. In three volumes. I. Ireland; II. England, Scotland, and the Colonies; III. America. Volume I., Ireland, containing Sketches of the Convents established by the Holy Foundress, and their earlier developments. By a Member of the Order of Mercy, Authoress of the "Life of Catharine McAuley," "Life of St. Alphonsus," "Life of Clement F. Hoffbauer," "Glimpses of Pleasant Homes," etc. New York: The Catholic Publication Society Company. 1881.

The Annals of the Sisters of Mercy cannot fail to interest every one who loves to read of the works and achievements in the wide field of its charitable ministrations—more glorious than the highest exploits of the world's most renowned soldiers, statesmen, scientists, and philosophers. The volume before us comprises the most interesting of those interesting annals,—those referring to the origin, foundation, progress, labors, difficulties, and successful results of the Order in Ireland, its present condition and numerical strength. The narration of them by so practiced and highly gifted a writer as the authoress makes their perusal all the more attractive.

APPLETON'S STANDARD SYSTEM OF PENMANSHIP. Prepared by Lyman Smith. D. Appleton & Co.: Boston, New York, and Chicago.

We have received from Messrs. Appleton & Co. samples of different series of their system of penmanship. They comprise, respectively, short courses for tracing letters in lead pencil and in ink intended for beginners, and two longer and fuller courses for more advanced pupils. They also contain "model drill and movement exercises," designed to educate the muscles of the arm and fingers so to produce free and easy movements in using the pen. Ample and clear directions are given respecting the movements that should be made, and the proper manner of forming and connecting the letters. It is claimed that the system will produce a free and practical style of writing in the school-room; and, from the examination we have made, we are of the opinion that the series is well designed to accomplish its intended purpose.